

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER, to whom
all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXVI

APRIL, 1933

No. 154

EDITORIAL

THE main thesis of Dr. C. E. Raven's Alexander Robertson lectures on *Jesus and the Gospel of Love* is that the Christian faith can only be understood rightly if it is disentangled from "belief in a dualism of natural and supernatural," which is un-Christian in origin, but from early centuries has infected traditional orthodoxy both in the East and in the West. Throughout his exposition of what he holds to have been the primitive Christianity of the Gospels, and of its perversion, Dr. Raven assumes that the immanentist theism which he espouses is the only form of theism which is philosophically tenable: he nowhere allows that the contrast between "natural" and "supernatural" can make any appeal to the intellect on objectively valid grounds. In his fourth lecture on "The Character of Religious Experience" he accounts for belief in it as the rationalization of a type of mystical experience which belongs to Oriental quietism and not to the practice of truly Christian devotion. The argument is as follows. The kind of mystical experience described is achieved by the stilling of the higher faculties of the human mind. "Cut off the play of thought, reduce the sensitiveness of the faculties, abstract the attention from its environment, and whether this be done by drug or concentration or fatigue, the result is a trance of rapture." "It is from experience such as this that there arises the concept of an eternal or supernatural order existing alongside of the phenomenal—a concept which has become a commonplace of religion. It is the obvious deduction from such mysticism."

It is interesting to contrast with this view the thought of the American Platonist, Mr. Paul Elmer More, as indicated in two papers published in the March number of THEOLOGY and in the present issue. Canon H. T. Knight's paper on the true norm of Christian devotion, entitled "Three Ways, or One?" is based on Mr. More's essay on *Christian Mysticism*, in which the un-

Christian nature of the "Oriental" mysticism is recognized as clearly as in anything that Dr. Raven has written. But in his own paper on "Liberal Catholics and the Incarnation," published in March, Mr. More attacks directly the type of christological speculation which Dr. Raven represents. It is quite clear that in Mr. More's case his dualism is no deduction from the type of religious experience which he repudiates.

There was also published in the March number of THEOLOGY a paper on "Worship and Sacrifice" by Professor C. F. Rogers, in which on psychological grounds he claimed a place in Christian devotion for the worship in which the "instinct of self-negation" is given expression. "Hence the vitality of the Mass in Christian history. It is the chief form of sacrifice in the Church in which man hallows his instinctive self-negation and gets out of himself into a larger world. It is spoiled if we turn it into a means of edification. There is a place for Evangelism, in the pulpit, in the press, in the schools. But to try to make the Mass 'impressive' is to foster self-consciousness and fatal to worship." Such worship would be anathema to Dr. Raven. But must it also be ruled out as inadmissible by those of us who, like Mr. More, are deeply critical of quietistic mysticism while retaining our belief in the distinction between the natural and the supernatural?

The question cannot be answered unless we go beyond the purely psychological point of view, and take into consideration the objective character of the God whom we worship. The vital issue is not between an "activist" or "quietist" attitude on our part; there may well be room for both in a full life. What matters is whether in our "quietist" moments we identify ourselves with some impersonal Absolute or cosmic force, or resign ourselves into the hands of the God revealed in Jesus Christ. The faith which believes in the contrast between natural and supernatural bears witness to the truth that in all true religion it is God who acts first, and all that we can do is to respond to His call through the power that He gives us. It is His will to enable us to respond to His love; by so doing we grow in freedom and true self-hood. So when we prostrate ourselves before Him in adoration, we do not sink back into oneness with a sub-personal infinite, but acknowledge our dependence on the living God.

So, in the last resort, it is not the psychological issue, but the theological which discriminates between false and true worship.

And, further, what is true of the relation between theology (in its strict sense, as the doctrine of God) and psychology is also true of the relation between theology and theories of the modes of God's presence with the worshipper. The real danger of idolatry in sacramental devotions, whether liturgical or extra-liturgical, does not lie in the danger of falsely conceiving the relations between spirit and matter; it lies in the danger of forgetting that the Lord before whom we bow is the same Jesus Christ who calls to us out of hospitals, slums and prisons, saying: "Inasmuch as ye have done it to the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me." It should surely be the glory of the comprehensive Church of the Anglican communion that in it the evangelical emphasis on the revealed character of God prevents its catholic devotion from ever degenerating into the emotional cult of a *mysterium tremendum et fascinans*.

L. H.

ENTOAH KAINH*

(St. John xiii. 34.)

THE New Commandment is the climax reached in this remarkable chapter, and no exegesis can be satisfactory which does not account for the steps by which it is reached. The chapter is introduced with the greatest possible solemnity: "Jesus knew that the hour was come that He should depart out of this world to the Father." It is the beginning of the end. The occasion is a Supper which we cannot fail to identify by its incidents with the *Last Supper*, and its date is *before* the Feast of the Passover began—one day before, as we afterwards learn—and not on the first day of Unleavened Bread. But none the less it is a Paschal celebration—the Passover that our Lord with desire had desired to eat with His disciples before He suffered. Of this we shall find indications in the narrative; and it is not in any way surprising that, as our Lord thought of it and spoke of it as such, it had been mistakenly ascribed to the regular date in the synoptic tradition.

We naturally look for the Evangelist's own guidance in the sequence of his thoughts, and it seems significant that he opens with a predicate that may symbolize what follows: "Jesus having loved His own that were in the world, loved them to the end"—*εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς*. This, apart from the context, might well stand (and is commonly understood) as a summary of the whole "perfect life of love" consistently pursued to the last breath. But He expressly qualifies the statement by a note of time—"before the Feast of the Passover"—which began on the following day. He must therefore be confining His thoughts to the limits of the day now present—*i.e.*, the night of the Last Supper. It seems inevitable that his aorist *ἠγάπησεν* refers to an action, or actions, on the present occasion whereby our Saviour proved His love for them to the end—not as yet the end of life, but the end of *love*, the furthest limit to which love can go.

One such action is immediately narrated—the washing of the disciples' feet—and the narration is so closely joined to what precedes, with simply a *καί*, as to appear rather to identify than to illustrate the general statement. To the Evangelist it was primarily an act of *unreserved affection*, of love that will go the whole way. To this I will return later; but let me say at once that, in view of the language and sequence of this passage, it seems to me clear that it is to this action in particular that

* A paper read at Kirkby Lonsdale to the 515th Meeting of the Lunesdale Clerical Society.

our Lord is made to appeal more than once in the words καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς—"even as I loved you."

If we compare the teaching based on this incident with that recorded by St. Luke as issuing from a φιλονεικία among the Apostles, we find it is substantially identical. In particular, the washing of the feet is the express realism of the saying: "I am in the midst of you as he that serveth." The two Gospels are mutually complementary in referring to one occasion. Thus we find that the incident arose through a dispute about prestige. St. Luke says that the question was τὸ τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων—i.e., it was a question of reputations, of appearances, not perhaps an ambition to be preferred in dignity (as in the case of the sons of Zebedee), but a reluctance to seem overshadowed by an equal and so to compromise dignity. Such a squabble illustrates the weakness of all these men who were designated to be enthroned as Israel's judges, and St. Luke finds it apt for record in close connexion with the announcement that one of them was a traitor. But he does not necessarily imply that the dispute arose at that point of the evening's events. We know of no custom of washing feet in the course of a banquet. It was a normal feature before a feast began, and would certainly not be dispensed with in a party that had just walked into the city from Bethany. This holds the records together, and provides a natural sequence. The washing of the feet is the first incident of the Last Supper. Our Lord has taken His natural place at the table, and (δείπνου γινομένου) supper is in course of being served, when a deadlock occurs because no one of the Twelve is willing to appear in the midst as one that serveth. The Lord and Master rises from His place, and performs the ministry Himself, and only then develops His teaching. An Apostle is not greater than He that gave his commission: "Ye ought to wash one another's feet."

In our amazement at the humility of this action it is possible to miss the Evangelist's thought of it as first and foremost an act of love. It witnessed, of course, to the truth that love is an activity, working in service and sacrifice; it involves humility and accepts humiliation, but is itself something much wider. Indeed, we find immediately in the incident the divine consecration of the social tact that delights in resolving difficulties, by observing the susceptibilities and saving the faces of others. But the special character of the present action stressed in the Gospel is that while men, and even apostles, will set themselves limits that they cannot pass, the Perfect Example stuck at nothing but went the whole way—εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς.

After this incident the Supper proceeds, doubtless according to the accustomed Paschal ritual of the morrow. At some point

in its course, as was well known, the announcement was made of the coming Betrayal. This Evangelist, who has from the beginning of the chapter kept us conscious of the presence of a traitor and of his identity, has certainly some special reasons for developing the story of that announcement afresh. We may discern such reasons in the discrepancies found in the earlier Gospels. There was a discrepancy in the traditions as to the order of events, and also as to the indication of the traitor. Let me briefly review the position on these two points.

St. Mark relates the prediction in general terms. It is one of the Twelve, one who eateth with the Master and dippeth with Him in the dish. The disciples were grieved and suspected no one. Indeed, one after another raised the question: μή τι ἐγώ—"Surely it is not I?" We are not told that any such questions were answered. The impersonal character of the reply shows that our Lord did not intend to identify the traitor, but to divert their thoughts to the fulfilment of prophecy. This account has been afterwards rationalized. "One after another" becomes *every one*, but still the reply is in general terms, and we might still gather that the identification was not to be made. Yet some one who did not see this has gone a step further and added a gloss: "And Judas answered and said, Is it I, Lord? He saith to him, Thou hast said"; which in all MSS. of St. Matthew is found appended (most awkwardly) to the woe pronounced against that man. The question must inevitably arise, If the identity of the traitor was revealed, why did not the eleven put restraint upon him? They were clearly apprehensive of danger—it could hardly have been otherwise after the experiences of the last few days—and as we know, some of them had taken the precaution of arming themselves.

The other discrepancy in the tradition was the order of events. In St. Mark and St. Matthew we find the prediction made before, in St. Luke *after*, the institution of the Eucharist. This may seem an unimportant divergence, but it certainly involved a very serious question—Was Judas Iscariot, or was he not, actually initiated into the New Covenant? What light, then, does the Gospel shed on these uncertainties? The account can obviously have come only from the disciple whom Jesus loved. St. Peter had a reason for beckoning to him. He had observed that the Master was concerned to denounce the treachery rather than the traitor. He might still be willing to communicate the name to a chosen few. And the reply, given privately to the beloved disciple, "He it is to whom I shall give the sop," was not primarily a means of identification, and but for the fact that it *provided* a means of identification would easily be taken simply as an equivalent of what was said openly to all. But

there was something in the incident which closed the lips of that disciple; and what it was we must learn from the known customs of the table. The giving of portions and differentiations in the gift are familiar from several instances. In patriarchal days Joseph sent portions to all his brethren, and a five-fold portion to Benjamin. Elkanah at his sacrificial feasts gave portions to all, and a double portion to Hannah, his favourite wife. Samuel on a memorable occasion reserved a choice portion for Saul. Moreover we can understand that when cooked meat was served the only available means of partaking of the meat-juices and sauce was for each of the guests to absorb them from the common dish by dipping a sippet of bread. No doubt all these customs had been observed on the present occasion, and we have reached a point where there is only *one* sippet in view—the sop which the Master would dip and could give *only to one*. In such circumstances the gift must have connoted, if not a distinction, at least a sure token of individual affection and fellowship. It would entirely disarm any suspicion of Judas Iscariot for the *ten*; and as for the beloved disciple, if he reacted at all from his amazement at the love expressed for the least worthy of all, he would probably rest in the thought that after this all would be well. Meanwhile, perhaps in a moment or two, the sop had been dipped and given. Judas was able to resist even this grace, and so, *after the sop*, Satan was in full possession. The traitor rises immediately, and, entirely unsuspected by any of the eleven, passes on his diabolical errand into the outer darkness.

Thus the incident of the sop is exactly in line with that of the washing of the feet. The love of Jesus for His own was without reserve and without consideration of their deserts. That is love *to the end*. But we shall remember that only the earlier incident was as yet appropriated by the Apostles.

One other remark must be made before we leave the giving of the sop. It affords to my mind the strongest confirmation that the Last Supper was a Paschal meal. We know that the essential feature of that Feast was the eating of the flesh of a lamb roast with fire. We know that it was a strict requirement that it should be *entirely* consumed, and we do not know of any such requirement or custom at any other meal. I have already pointed out the *finality of the sop*. When Judas received it the consumption of the animal food was complete. Nothing would remain until the morning. There remained on the table only Bread and Wine.

The exit of the traitor quite evidently marks a break in the narrative; it is dramatically the close of the first Act. The old order is accomplished. The Evangelist opens the second

Act, not with a fresh recital of the Institution (which was sufficiently well known) but with a commentary upon it, which it was his special function to record: "When therefore he was gone out" (not before) Jesus says: "Now is the Son of Man glorified," *νῦν ἐδοξάσθη*—an aorist of an event just realized. His glorification has begun. Surely it is shallow exegesis to explain this simply by Judas's departure. No; the glory of the Son of Man was achieved *through sacrifice*. If the glorification has begun, it is because the final sacrifice has begun. This is the teaching of the Institution, where the Body is already being given and the Blood already being outpoured. The sacrifice of the morrow is realized in the present.

And the glorification now begun will be forthwith accomplished. God will *straightway* glorify Him. The imminence and the finality of His departure out of the world are dwelt upon: "Only a little while am I yet with you, and whither I go ye cannot come." The fellowship of this present life is soon to be broken, and broken for good. Such reflexions suggest *urgency* for what follows:

ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους.

This, you will remember, is translated (R.V.):

"A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another."

The meaning of this is perfectly clear. The command is a command to love one another, which is repeated with the significant qualification "as I have loved you." "I command you to love one another—yea, to love one another even as I have loved you." The *καθὼς* makes a comparison between their love for each other and His love for them throughout His ministry. So also in xv. 12 (a passage to which I shall return): "This is My commandment": *ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς*. I have already given reasons for thinking that the aorist *ἠγάπησα* in both texts refers to the washing of the feet. The similarity of the two texts is remarkable, and would be *complete* but for the repetition of the *ἵνα* clause in the present place. I have not been able to find a parallel for this, and especially with a qualifying clause preceding.

The reviser's translation of the text is, it is needless to say, unexceptionable in respect of the Greek words and idiom.

(i.) The phrase *ἐντολὴν δοῦναι*, "to give a command," occurs several times in this Gospel and nowhere else. And seeing that "His commandments are not grievous," that they are

given us for joy and not for grief, we should almost certainly read into the phrase the thought of a precious gift; but the use in xi. 57, where the chief priests and the Pharisees *δεδώκεισαν ἐντολὰς*, that if any one knew where He was he should give information with a view to His arrest, shows plainly that, as in English, it is a colourless phrase.

(ii.) Again, the sub-final clause introduced by *ἵνα* to define the content of a command or request is extraordinarily frequent in the New Testament. I have counted in my Concordance no less than ninety citations where the use of the particle is so classified. It is indeed so frequent that one is in danger of overlooking cases in which the clause may have a purely final sense, expressing the purpose of the predicate.

But the question inevitably arises: *Is the commandment to love one another a new commandment?* This is, of course, not to call in question our blessed Lord's words, but our own perception of His meaning. He had expressly summarized the second Table of the Law in this commandment in which it is briefly comprehended. He had taught them to love their enemies, to *do good* to the reviler and the ungrateful, after the example of the heavenly Father. And He had given them just now an example and a precept in order that they should do even as He had done to them. And now as He has consciously entered upon the last stage of His self-sacrifice, and knows that His glorification has begun—now that the imminence and finality of his separation from them presses upon Him—can we be satisfied that His *ἐντολὴ καινὴ* is no more than a recapitulation of His former teaching? No doubt an argument can be based on the word *καινὴ*. It is not so much a new commandment as a *commandment anew*, not new in kind but new in condition—the old revelation of the Father's will which they had from the beginning, promulgated afresh with a new sanction. All this is perfectly true, and every one must determine for himself how far it is convincing in exegesis. I must own that, for myself, it has ceased to be satisfying—rather the argument of a special pleader. The whole trend of the narrative appears to require that the *ἐντολὴ καινὴ* shall break new ground and not be simply a restatement of familiar teaching.

And there is another consideration that weighs considerably in my mind. St. John, in two passages of his Epistles (1 John ii. 7, 8 and 2 John 5), employs contradictory language. In the former place he says: *οὐκ ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν . . . ἀλλ' ἐντολὴν παλαιάν ἣν εἶχετε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς . . . πάλιν ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν*, and in the second: *οὐχ ὡς ἐντολὴν γράφων σοι καινὴν ἀλλ' ἣν εἶχομεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, in both places referring to the commandment to love one another. Here, of course,

there is no question of contrary teaching; it is purely a matter of diction. The commandment is the commandment of the ancient covenant; it has become new because the darkness is passing away and the true light already shineth. My difficulty is this: I cannot conceive that a man who recorded these solemn words of Christ with such deliberate care would employ them in the same sense in his pastoral correspondence with a negative prefixed, nor that he should choose to emphasize the *ancient* aspect of a commandment which the Divine Master had chosen at such a moment to set forth as *new*. This compels the conclusion that St. John did not understand the New Commandment on our Lord's lips within the limitations in which he himself uses the words; we have to seek a larger horizon that will include the specific command. And, if this be so, the *ἵνα* clause will not be definitive of the commandment, but will express the purpose with which the commandment is given. The translation will be: "I give you ἐντολὴν καινὴν *in order that* ye may love one another." Let me offer you corroboration of this view.

I have already referred to the verbal affinity of this passage to the words in xv. 12: αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ ἣ ἐμὴ—"this is the commandment that *I give*"—ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς. That passage must in turn be related to what follows in the seventeenth verse—ταῦτα ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους—which is translated (R.V.): "These things I command you, that ye may love one another," the revisers here abandoning the defining use of *ἵνα* for a strictly final sense. To me it seems impossible to distinguish the two forms of the same sentence: "This is My commandment . . ." and "These things I command you." In the latter ταῦτα is obviously resumptive as usual, referring to what has gone before. If so, why should αὕτη in the former be anticipatory of a commandment afterwards expressed? I prefer to translate the twelfth verse: "This is My commandment"—i.e., "The foregoing commandment I give you in order that ye may love one another even as I loved you." What, then, is the foregoing commandment? The passage contains the allegory of the Vine and the Branches, teaching that fruitfulness in good works depends on the communication of the vitality of Christ. There may be many commandments implicit in the teaching, but it is certain that there are two plain imperatives: (i.) "Abide in Me and I in you"; (ii.) "Abide ye in My love." These are commandments given in order that they may love each other as He loved them. I cannot help feeling that this consistent translation of the *ἵνα* clause gives a more sequential order to verse 12, which

otherwise seems an echo or refrain interrupting the progress of the discourse.

We have now approached the problem of this paper both by a careful consideration of the sequence of events at the Last Supper and by a study of the language employed in this and other relevant texts. The course of the known incidents brings this saying into close connexion with the institution of the Eucharist, an instrument of the new and better covenant that God makes with His people. I conclude that the *ἐντολή καινή* of which the Lord speaks is the *καινή διαθήκη*. Let us see whether this will satisfy all the requirements.

(i.) The term "covenant" was found a significant idea to express God's dealing with mankind. It reminded man that he had conditions laid upon him to fulfil. But the ordinary Greek word *συνθήκη* implied the terms of a bargain between equals and could not be applied to such a relation as that between God and man. Therefore the LXX adopted another compound, *διαθήκη*—properly a testamentary word meaning disposition of goods, to express the relation. The covenant is an act of grace. God in His goodness promises to dispense His mercies, but requires a definite response from man. A commandment is therefore necessarily inherent in a covenant of grace. And so the writer to the Hebrews (ix. 15) (in the place where he is describing the Atonement made at the inauguration of the first covenant) substitutes *ἐνετείλατο* for *διέθετο* of the LXX of Exodus and makes Moses say: *τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς ἐνετείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεός*, which shows that the *διαθήκη* as proceeding from God is a command. "He hath commanded His covenant for ever" (Ps. cxi. 9).

That ancient covenant *failed* that a place might be sought for a better covenant. And St. Paul's analysis of the failure is that the law had no power to make alive—*ζωοποιῆσαι*. And accordingly prophets foresaw a new covenant under which the law would not be *without* the man but *within*, vitally appropriated, written on his heart.

(ii.) In the next place, our Lord in the Institution chooses to employ language which inevitably recalls those words of Moses at the inauguration of the first covenant, "This is My Blood of the covenant" or "This is the new covenant in My Blood." This appears decisive that in the Institution He was consciously inaugurating the New Covenant of prophecy, and that He made His ordinance the covenanted means of grace.

(iii.) Again, without confining the imperative aspect of the covenant we must not overlook the fact that the Institution *has* its definite commands—"Take and eat this"; "Drink ye

all of this "; execute the whole action to make a remembrance of Me—nor that these commands offer the promise of life—life eternal here and now, and resurrection at the last day. The sacramental gifts are set forth as the very means whereby we abide in Christ and He in us. It is the Spirit that quickeneth. In Christ shall all be made alive. This is the redemption of failure in the first covenant, and *enables* men to love one another as He gave commandment.

(iv.) Moreover, this exegesis does account for the *urgency* expressed by our Lord in those reflexions "Only a little while longer I am with you" and "Whither I go ye cannot come." So far as we can see, there was no special urgency for a re-enactment of the command to love one another: in fact, it was repeated later on. But there *was* urgency for the Institution, if it was to be made at all. They were reaching the last moments of the Last Supper, and the elements were on the table. The traitor had departed and the Lord was left alone with the faithful Apostles. And as the visible fellowship was so soon to be broken, it is a fitting climax that He should provide for perpetual communion with Him in the unseen.

On all these grounds together I am convinced that the *ἐντολὴ καινὴ* of which Christ here speaks is the New Covenant. It fulfils the types of the old, but, in contrast with the purely ritual use of blood by Moses, the Mediator of the better covenant gives His own life after death to be appropriated by the faithful that they may abide in His love and be fruitful in good works. The sacrifice of the Cross is already realized in the Sacrament, and so the glorification of the Son of Man begins in the Institution. And if anyone should think that the purpose assigned—"that ye may love one another"—is inadequate for the enactment of a New Covenant, he will remember that (as St. John knew well) this is an acid test of a man's love to God.

I have only one more remark to make before submitting my paper to your criticism. We have still left the difficulty of the *ἵνα* clause repeated with a qualification prefixed. I have been unable to find any parallel to this in the Gospel. There is undoubtedly a tendency in this Gospel to employ *καθὼς* to unite two sentences or clauses of *equal length*, the correspondence of thought being realized in a balanced expression. A number of instances you will immediately recognize: "*Even as* I hear, I judge"—"That all men may honour the Son *even as* they honour the Father"—"*Even as* the living Father sent Me and I live because of the Father, he that eateth Me he also shall live because of Me"—"That ye also may do, *even as* I did to you"—"*Even as* the Father hath sent Me, I also send you"—"If ye keep My commandments ye shall

abide in My love, *even as* I have kept My Father's commandments and abide in His love"—"*Even as* the Father hath loved Me, I also have loved you"—"*Even as* the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, so neither can ye except ye abide in Me." The tendency is probably instinctive rather than studied, and I am not suggesting that it can be erected into a law. But it is at least worth noticing that we get the same balance, without the difficulty of the repeated clause, if we compare together what precedes and what follows the *καθώς* in this passage. The meaning will then be, "I give you a New Commandment, in order that ye may love one another, *even as* I loved you, in order that ye also may love one another." The correspondence will be between the giving of the New Commandment and the washing of the feet. The purpose is identical in both: but whereas the act of love claimed obedience to a great Example, the New Covenant gives the power to obey. There is a certain attraction in this translation, and it might be argued that it is favoured by the insertion of an *also* in the second *ἵνα* clause. For "ye *also* may love" implies a previous mention of someone else's love, whereas it is assumed in the accepted translation that "I loved you" is subordinate to this clause. But I am certain that in Greek idiom if the qualification could be prefixed as here for emphasis, the mere fact that it contained a statement "I loved you" would justify *καὶ ὑμεῖς* in the clause to which it is subordinate. However, the strongest objection to this translation is the recurrence of the phrase *καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς* in xv. 12, where it clearly qualifies *ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους*. But there it *follows*, and no difficulty arises—just as no difficulty would arise here if the second *ἵνα* clause were eliminated. As the passage stands with no MS. divergence, I am bound to confess that it is more probable to me that *ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε* is subordinate to *ἠγάπησα* than that *καθὼς ἠγάπησα* is subordinate to *ἀγαπᾶτε*.

R. PERCIVAL BROWN.

MIRACLES AND MODERN THOUGHT

THE subject of miracles is not one which may be described as a really "live" issue in modern thought, a fact which seems proved by the lack of reference to it in recent theological writing. It does not rank as the kind of problem about which young people are greatly concerned, as perhaps it would have done

fifty years ago. Yet it is not entirely academic, for it is part of a wider problem—that of the relationship of God to the world. Our view of miracles is definitely governed by our view of that relationship. In such a context it has been recently dealt with by thinkers such as Dr. A. E. Taylor, Dr. Tennant, Dr. Headlam and Dr. Cairns. The general feeling among leading men of science and thought seems to leave the question as at least an open issue, and conclusion either way as too difficult.

What are the arguments which may be brought against miracle? They may be summed under the heads of: (a) How does this affect apparently established Natural Law? (b) Is the evidence convincing? and (c) Has the event adduced as miracle any real value towards religious living?

(a) Dean Inge has said: "Where there is no law there is no miracle," and we only recognize a miracle because it is unusual and does not fit in with what we already know. A world of cosmic order is one that appeals to our reason, and miracles are unreasonable because they are "disorderly." Hence the dislike of philosophers for miracles. Any that they do accept they seek to fit in to their system and so prove that they are not miracles at all. It is doubtful whether a miracle which simply indicated an as yet unknown law could be regarded as a real miracle in the fullest sense, as ultimately all would be law again. Spinoza held that all laws of nature were decrees of God, and his system so identifies God with the natural order that for God to perform a miracle would be utterly impossible. It would be self-contradiction if His nature were consistent, as it must be. Another great philosopher, Hume—despite his attack on the law of Cause and Effect—held that the nexus of natural events was knit together in order, and he denied the possibility of miracles on the ground that no evidence could ever be so strong as to outweigh the evidence for the consistent scheme which he held was discovered. Kant's position is typical of himself. He allows the theoretical possibility of miracles, but they are not practically possible. They might happen, but they never do. As a true Prussian, he urges that this is a matter for the Government, which in ancient times exercised control over prodigies, and prodigy performers. The Government would be afraid that they might spread and the Constitution thereby be endangered. Curiously enough a recent play, *Miracle at Verdun*, takes up a position somewhat similar. Kant also puts forward a view, with which many would agree, that the concept of natural law is one that is too valuable to be easily let go. If we start with this it is possible for the human mind to advance further in

knowledge, and bring more phenomena under its sway, but miracles "deject the mind, overwhelm the intelligence and deprive it of trust in itself." Thus it might be that the whole structure of human understanding would be deprived of value. Miracle is relegated by Kant to the far side of his line between the phenomenal and the noumenal, and of the latter we can really know nothing. For us the world is a system and reveals order at every point. In relation to any system of natural law miracles are unintelligible and antecedently improbable. Therefore, if the uniformity of nature is sufficiently proved by human experience, and its laws are of that class which never shall be broken, then miracles would be reasonably rejected.

(b) The charge against miracles is also one of evidence, and this is of great cogency. Is the witness to miracle ever strong enough to disprove the uniformity of nature? Thus it might be urged that the New Testament records are scanty, and not always in agreement with each other. The witness is often at second hand, and in all cases is offered by those who were already convinced of the claims made by Jesus Christ. To see those claims substantiated by signs and wonders would be a natural tendency, and it is no matter of surprise that such events are described in the Gospels. A witness to miracle is now regarded as credulous, because modern men are incredulous; as exaggerating, whereas the modern man tends to undervalue; and as guilty of error, until his innocence can be demonstrated. Dr. Tennant in his discussion of miracle evidently feels that it is on the evidence that the case is weakest. A purely historical treatment of the problem will not easily convince anyone of the truth of miracles. Even if events of a remarkable kind did happen they may easily have been interpreted as miracles, in view of the notorious tendency of human observers to heighten their first impressions. Whatever miracle there may have been may have been read into the event by the witness. In addition to this, there is what Dr. Taylor cites as the "anthropological" argument, which is for many a convincing refutation of miracles. The study of primitive religion has shown how easily miracles are attached to great religious geniuses in their own lifetime, or soon afterwards. The existence of such stories everywhere throws considerable doubt on their truth anywhere. Prescientific man expresses his astonishment at the appearance of a great personality by the attribution to him of marvellous powers in the world of nature, since he has them in the world of spiritual excellence. But it is his quality in the latter field which is the real cause of his greatness, and the elimination of the wonderful elements from the story does not therefore affect his real importance.

(c) Even if one could accept miracles as possible and based on sound testimony, would they have any religious value? Do they make a real difference to religion? Kant did not think so, and asserted that they could only be held to be of value if they were efficacious to morality. Towards the solid and severe task of moral amendment they were of no avail, and in fact might be regarded as rather a hindrance than a help. There cannot be a moral miracle, for morality is the product of long and toilsome endeavour. Even if one does not equate religion with morality, there are many who do not feel that miracles are of religious value, for what appeals to them is the personality of the Master they follow, and the principles of His living. His birth, signs and wonders attributed to Him, strange happenings attached to His death—these are not the things which capture them. They would be satisfied with a reply with which John would not have been satisfied: "The blind do not receive their sight, and the lame do not walk; the deaf do not hear, and the lepers are not cleansed, and the dead are not raised up—but the poor have the gospel preached to them." Dr. Fosdick has said: "The modern man does not regard the age of miracles with any wistful desire to have them back again. He glories in the achievements and possibilities of the age of law, and in practical living he does not miss miracle at all." Therefore it might be urged that Christianity non-miraculous is as effective and vital as the old miraculous type of Christianity, especially as it may demand a deeper emphasis on the more purely spiritual aspects of Christ's personality. Thus our view of Christianity might be said to be an advance on that of our ancestors.

This, then, may be said to be the case which can be made out against miracle in modern thought, and at first sight there is no doubt that it is strong. On the other hand, there is another side to the question, and there is a definite reaction in the minds of many to the extreme case which has in earlier days convinced those to whom it was presented.

(a) On the question of miracles and natural law, it is worth noting that Dr. Rashdall was prepared to allow the theoretical possibility of miracles, in a world apparently governed by laws of nature. High scientific authority may be cited for the view that so-called laws of nature are actually descriptions of phenomena and events as they are linked together in human experience and in the minds of the observers. Even if every event conformed to a certain uniform pattern, that is no guarantee that the pattern is for ever fixed as it is so far understood, although the postulate of such a final uniformity may be of the greatest value for further research. It might even be that the whole system is simply the production of the human mind in its necessity to deal

practically with phenomena. To assume that the scheme is the last word on the subject is to make oneself the servant of a useful theory which should be one's instrument for research rather than the master of one's thinking. The uniformity of nature was made for man, and not man for the uniformity of nature. Such a conclusion may open the door to an extreme subjectivity, but the place of the mind in nature is such that one may not forget the place of nature in mind. Moreover, there are such vast uncovered tracts yet in nature that dogmatic conclusions would be at least premature. The web of uniformity may be more flexible, and stand more stretching, than some have thought. If miracles are facts, then the theory must be wide enough to include these facts even if they are unwelcome. The temper of recent scientific thought is less assured than it was, although the theory of uniformity has produced such magnificent results.

(b) The problem of evidence arises at this point, because it may be denied that the facts or events described as miracles ever really happened, and therefore do not call for explanation, or do not challenge the usual methods of explanation within the scheme of uniformity. Dr. Tennant held that the question was ultimately one of evidence, if miracles were theoretically possible. Dr. Taylor is caustic on the attack which is sometimes made on the witness of the disciples to the New Testament miracles. "However different," he says, "the mental habits of the first Christian disciples may have been from those of a modern European B.Sc., it is at least certain that the Apostles and their converts were not 'primitive savages' who could not distinguish between waking life and dreams, or had never bethought themselves that a resurrection from the dead is a startling departure from familiar routine. It was precisely because men like St. Peter and St. Paul were as familiar as we are with the distinction between "customary experience" and "miracle" that they saw the hand of God so conspicuous in the miracle which they put in the forefront of their message to the world."* He points out also that "they were members of a society which had possessed a high civilization for centuries. . . . It is nonsense to assert that the society which saw the rise of Christianity acquiesced in the marvellous elements of the Christian story because it was its habit to believe any marvel related of anyone and by anyone without discrimination."† Thus he would meet the charge he describes as the "anthropological" argument by seeing a real difference in the Christian miracles from those which indiscriminately are attributed to other religious leaders.

* *Faith of a Moralist*, vol. ii., p. 160.

† *Ibid.*, p. 161.

(c) On the third problem of the religious values of miracles there is something to be said in favour by those who defend the traditional position. Kant made one concession here in that he allowed that they might have occurred as a "send-off" to a new religion. Only by such a shock to normal routine could the average man of the period be startled into looking into the claims of the person whose works they were. Such a view would explain why miracles have not happened since Apostolic days. Miracles might from another angle be regarded as valuable endorsements of the claims, and in some sense "sacramental," outward and visible signs of the inward and spiritual power of the person performing them. Hence the attitude to the person would determine the attitude to the miracles. It is also possible that many are satisfied religiously by a miraculous element in their Christianity, as it yields the assurance of a power of personality greater than the often apparently relentless pressure of external necessity. If all miracle is rejected, then one valuable element in religion may have been sacrificed, and the slight but real position of human freedom in a universe of scientific law be completely eliminated. It is possible to become too cramped in such a world, and the belief in miracles is one assertion of the human spirit that it will not be so cramped. This cramping notion affects too the view one has of Christ, because there are few who do not sympathize with the motives attributed to Him in the performing of miracles. Nobody can fail to appreciate the supposed motive behind, for example, the raising of Lazarus, or the feeding of the five thousand, or the miracles of healing, but it is the method which puzzles the mind. One value is secured, and another goes, and one has to determine which is the more valuable of the two.

In conclusion, the enquiry does suggest that there are two views of natural law tenable today, the one based on mechanical analogies, the other based on biological. One is of a world wherein all things are as they are and ever shall be in a machinery of rigidly determined law, the other of what Tennant calls a "relatively settled" world, where there is room for new things to happen and new situations to arise. Concepts such as "emergence," "newness," and real "development" suggest that the world may be of the second kind, and may be an organism rather than a machine. The whole attitude of uncertainty in modern science endorses a view which refrains from dogmatic assurance. The Rev. J. S. Bezzant has summed it up in these words, though in a different context: "Our knowledge is certainly insufficient to justify dogmatism that Nature is characterized by unvarying and invariable law. Laws of Nature summarize

Nature's behaviour but do not prescribe it. . . . On the other hand, we may conceive ways in which God may act directly without any breaches of law such as science could detect. We cannot presume to state, except broadly, what is or is not consistent with God's purposes, in God's providential ordering of the world."* There are two ways of looking at this ordering. Dr. Taylor says of them that the first is regarded as "strictly pervasive, yet never obtrusive," while the other thinks of "our system of customary experiences as being something of a misfit for a reality so much richer than this extract which has been shaped from it under the pressure of urgent physical need." The first view has no shocks or surprises, but the second view expects times when "the misfit will make itself specially manifest. There will be something catastrophic, violently irruptive . . . and at such times expectations based on customary experience will be liable to be suddenly and startlingly shattered."† This second view would allow for the possibility of miracles much more easily than the first, and there are many facts which bear it out.

On the question of human personality there is still much to learn. It is conceivable that a person with unique spiritual powers might possess unique powers in the world of nature. Supremacy in one field may be accompanied by supremacy in another. Human beings are at all times in play with circumstances, and the measure of their control may be the indication of their position in the scale of personal living. Hence the reply of Jesus to John might be a claim that the unusual circumstances surrounding Him indicate the nature and position of Him whom they surrounded. Everywhere that He went there went these works with Him, because on other grounds His was the perfection of personality in life.

There is another aspect of the situation which demands consideration, and that is the real possibility in modern thought of believing less than there is good reason to believe. Men may under-believe as a reaction against over-credulity in the minds of their fathers. Dr. Cairns is very caustic on this when, in discussing the intellectual sophistication of our own time, he writes: "It is surely too much to assert that an age like ours should take its own life and achievement as the normal standard, and rule out of the New Testament as myth, overbelief and legend all for which it can find no strict analogy in the life of today. The underlying assumption is that our own spiritual climate is that which is normal for the human race."‡ He

* *The Guardian*, Letter on September 29, 1932.

† *Faith of a Moralist*, vol. ii., p. 162.

‡ *The Faith which Rebels*, p. 156.

dismisses this as an odd self-complacency in the light of events.

Final conclusion on this subject is difficult. The older treatment of miracle is clearly out of date in every sense of the word. It proceeded from the outward to the inward—from the external events to the personality behind them. The modern treatment must be from the inward to the outward—from the person to the external events which may possibly accompany his appearance in the historical series. Those who "seek a sign" are trying to discern spiritual things without first having the eyes to see them even if they were there for the seeing. First, then, it is the eyes which are needed, and miracles do nothing to provide such requisites. But, given the eyes and the attitude of expectancy to see things with them, even things which eyes had never before seen may happen. No one could be compelled to believe in Jesus because of miracles, but a man might believe in miracles because of Jesus. Therefore it seems clear that the real emphasis should be laid upon the personality of Jesus Christ before the question of miracle is brought into the discussion at all. And yet it will become increasingly clear that the question will require, after a while, to be frankly and sincerely faced. Before a man can hold that "with God all things are possible" it is advisable that he know more fully the character and the purpose of God. It is surely, then, to that end that his interest should be first of all turned. "If," as Dr. Taylor says, "he does not see God in the *cursus ordinarius* of nature, neither will he believe though one rose from the dead." Thus it could happen that he who had come to believe in God on other grounds than miracles might eventually come to believe that with Him all things, even miracles, are indeed possible.

MARCUS KNIGHT.

"CONVERSION"

BY A CHRISTIAN JEW

INTRODUCTION

It is almost impossible to try to estimate the effect of the Great War on an average middle-class Jewish household; it was prodigious, almost as great a cataclysm as the destruction of Jerusalem.

When the Jews were freed from persecution in England in

the middle of the seventeenth century they formed themselves into separate communities, as, although they had absolute freedom, there was a tremendous amount of ill-feeling between them and the Christians, and in self-defence they lived in their own quarters and very rarely ventured out alone. As time passed the ill-feeling died down, but the strict Jewish laws forbade much intercourse with the Gentile, and prior to the war even the ordinary middle-class Jew seldom became intimate with a stranger; he never invited a Christian into his house, which largely accounts for the fact that the two races never intermingled. The expression "Oh, he is a Jew!" was sufficient to check any meditated advance by the Christian. Jews only appeared before the public on the music-hall stage as persons with large hooked noses who kept pawnbroker shops, and though it cannot be denied that many of them have that particular feature rather strongly curved, to those who know them they are a cultured, witty, and brilliantly clever race.

I was educated at home, and prior to the war had never been away from my mother in my life. I went to many dances in Jewish houses, and if I appeared at a public ball, it was as one of a large party, and I danced with members of it all the evening.

None of my family had any particular personal animus against Christians; but why should they have? they never knew any of them. There is no doubt that, if there had been no war, I would never have had the courage to break away from my own people and marry a Gentile, and if I had committed such a terrible crime I would never again have been allowed to enter my old home, and my parents would have cut me off entirely.

Few, if any, mixed marriages are anything but one long tragedy; they seldom survive the basic differences in temperament and upbringing. There seems always a lack of harmony in these marriages, and after the first raptures are over, racial differences leap to the fore and these unions degenerate into one long discord, frowned on by both Jews and Gentiles alike. That I have made an extremely happy marriage is due to the fact that I and my husband faced these difficulties together, and have now for some five years been spiritually united in the same Faith.

CONVERSION

When I married I was war-weary, and so was my husband. We were married before the Registrar, and we decided that religion "did not matter," and that we would agree to differ!

I was twenty-eight and my husband was thirty. "It did

not matter" for such a short while! It began to matter desperately when our first child was born, and when that child was old enough to ask "Who is Jesus?" it was the only thing in life that mattered at all. I read the New Testament for the first time when I was thirty-four, and so I read it as a grown-up person, not as a child does a lesson, but with my mature intelligence and an earnest desire to understand. Now, I know that reading the Gospels does not make a Christian, but believe me, they can go very far towards converting an unbeliever—they were a revelation to me, and I yearned for more.

I went to a wise old priest and asked to be made a Christian. His reply was: "Do not hurry; wait, read and pray; listen to what both believer and unbeliever tell you; wait a year, then come to me again and I will baptize you." I took his advice; I read religious books, I tried to pray, I went to church and then to Synagogue. I asked a Jew why he did not believe in the Divinity of Christ, and heard a Jewish idea of the Resurrection. One fact I noted: that never once, either from Jew or Gentile, did I hear one word of disparagement of the life of Christ; even those who disputed His Divinity owned that He was the example of perfect manhood.

I began to feel very nervous and depressed. Although I knew that only racial prejudices and superstition stopped me from taking the plunge, I could not make up my mind to forsake my own people—I felt it would be unlucky, so I wanted a definite sign. Just as life was becoming unbearable I received that sign. We took a furnished house by the sea for six weeks and I went down first to get it ready. When I entered the largest bedroom I saw hanging over the bed a Cross. My first thought was, "I must take that down," and I went to move it; as I put out my hand, I was forced on to my knees, and I knelt by myself and really against my will for some two or three moments before I was able to move. When I was released I took the Cross, kissed it, and laid it reverently away, and then went downstairs shaken to the depth of my soul. If I had been thinking about religion when I entered that room I would not have been so impressed, but my mind had been entirely occupied with other very mundane matters, so I could not attribute this experience to religious hysteria. I felt that the sign had been given, and I hesitated no longer, but wrote to my kindly priest and asked to be prepared for Baptism and Confirmation.

BAPTISM

One Sunday after Morning Service a few very intimate friends of mine waited behind to witness my christening.

I had been prepared for Baptism and Confirmation, and I was to be confirmed by the Bishop privately a few days later. I was half longing for, half dreading the coming ordeal. I ardently desired to have matters settled, but I shrank from the thought of the actual ceremonies.

We all gathered round the font and the service began. I felt myself trembling violently. I was sure I had forgotten all I had learned, and soon I should be asked questions and I had refused the offer of a Prayer Book. What could I do? Now I was being addressed.

"Well-beloved, who are come hither desiring to receive Holy Baptism, ye have heard how the congregation hath prayed that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to receive you and bless you, to release you of your sins, to give you the Kingdom of Heaven and everlasting life."

Suddenly I lost all sense of fear, lost sight of everyone, heard only a voice coming from a distance. I suppose I repeated my part of the service, for someone helped me to take off my veil, and now I was bending over the font, and someone was pouring water over me. The Sign of the Cross was made on my forehead, and then I was kneeling, filled with such a sense of the nearness of God that the place and all else faded into oblivion, and the voice that blessed me seemed to me the voice of our blessed Lord Himself.

I do not think that ever again I shall be permitted to experience such spiritual ecstasy, for only once in a lifetime is any ordinary person permitted to have the cloud withdrawn. Surely the memory of such a blessed moment should last for the remainder of life in this world.

Before that morning I had been a convert to Christianity for the sake of my husband and child; after it I tried to follow Christ in love, faith, and humility.

THE FIRST YEAR

I wonder if grown-up people ever really forget their first term at a new school: the feeling of utter helplessness; the uncertainty of knowing which class-room they are expected to be in, and what times the different lessons are being given; the terror of all the big boys or girls, and the desire to make at least one friend who will guide them through all the noise and confusion of a big school?

These are exactly the feelings I had that first year as a convert. And just as in a big school you have to find your own level, realize your own limitations, and be content with seeing others attain the popularity to which you always aspire, so I

had to learn by bitter experience that I had become a member of one of the largest schools in the world, whose class-rooms are so numerous it is well-nigh impossible to find out where you are expected, and its lessons so difficult that it seems that no new-comer can ever hope to learn them. A school where the times are so confusing and the time-tables so complicated that no tyro can read them correctly, and, worst of all, where the big boys and girls have no use or sympathy for the new-comer, and it seems impossible to make them realize that you are sincere in wanting to learn the lessons that the various pedagogues teach, and so become sufficiently proficient to be capable of understanding the teachings of the Great Master Himself.

If I failed, as fail I did, to enter into the life of this big school, was I more to blame than those people who, professing to be fully qualified teachers, were incapable of explaining to me more than the fundamental rules of the Establishment, or those pupils, much older than myself, who refused me the helping hand I needed so badly? I wanted all my courage (and I am a very cowardly person), all my newly acquired faith, to bring me through my first year.

Here is just one of my trying experiences. I was frightened of going to church, and I wondered if I would gain more confidence if I attended a Communion Service by myself in the middle of the week; there was one at 10.30 on Thursdays. So the following week, without telling anyone, I plucked up courage, and just as the clock was striking the quarter I entered the church. I tiptoed into the nearest pew and sat down; then suddenly remembering, I hastily knelt, too flustered to pray, only listening to the sound of my own heart beating against my ribs. A few people drifted in, mostly old ladies, and exactly at half-past ten the service commenced. I managed very well until it was time for the collection, when I realized with horror that I had forgotten to bring any money with me. I searched wildly in all my pockets, and to my unutterable relief at last discovered a penny. This I dropped into the bag handed to me by a dignified old lady, and continued standing until I realized that everyone else was kneeling, and I hastily dropped on to my knees, shaking with fright. To my intense surprise, though it was a Communion Service, no one went up to the altar rails, and before I realized it the clergyman pronounced the blessing and the congregation dispersed. I had not understood that I had been attending a special service at which the congregation were accustomed to offer their worship only and not communicate.

It was a long time before I ventured again into a church by myself. I fell back upon books; I seized every book I could

find—good or bad, hard or easy. I tried everything; I was hungry for knowledge, and I absorbed some curious ideas; but help was coming, it was literally forced on me by our own rector. He came to call, an ordinary parish visit; he brought the spirit of Christ with him. I had so nearly lost the way—he put me on the path again. I was very shy, rather rude; he took no notice, he lent me good books, read with me, explained the Epistles, and insisted on coming to see me. One remark of his I shall always remember, and I give it in the hope it may help somebody else: "A parson is the doctor for your soul. If you feel ill bodily, you call in a doctor; he doesn't come unless he knows you are ill and until you send for him. The same applies to your parson: he cannot know your soul is sick unless you tell him—then it is his work to try to cure you. Don't sit by yourself feeling worse every day. Conquer your shyness, ill-temper, or pride and ask for help. Every good priest will pray for strength to succour you." I have found that this is true, and looking back on my first year I realize that I myself was a great deal to blame for my loneliness, my feeling of desolation, and my petty humiliations and stupid mistakes.

PRAYER

I wonder how many people there are like me? I had no religious instruction as a child, have only really learnt "The Lord's Prayer" and the Creed, and have a very indifferent memory. To me, prayer is a very big problem; I listen to lectures, I buy many books and read many prayers, and yet I never can succeed in learning them by heart.

What do I do? I try to talk to God. I don't worry over set prayers and lots of instruction; I just kneel, or not, as I feel inclined, and talk to Him as though He were in my room, and I find that He is with me and that a feeling of perfect happiness and deep peace comes to me.

I used to be afraid that if I went to church regularly I should find that I was losing the tiny fraction of grace bestowed on me, and that familiarity might breed contempt, but I know now that I was wrong.

If I cannot pray I just cover my eyes and let the peace of the church, of the building itself, soak into my soul; an old church is always full of the prayers of the many who have worshipped God. The church will speak to me if I wait—God's own house; and I have learnt not to be distressed if my thoughts wander. They are bound to. I do not believe any ordinary layman can concentrate on prayer for very long. I am sure if

I pray for five moments and then rest in peace for the remainder of the service, God will hear me.

Here are two prayers I have learnt and made my own:

"Lord, I believe; help Thou my lack of faith."

"Lord Jesus, be Thou in my heart, on my lips and in my hands."

CHILDREN

I have been very anxious about my children because I do so want them to grow up good Christian men and women, and they are so quick to notice everything and they ask so many questions. Here is one question I have been asked. "Why must we waste a fine morning in a stuffy church? Surely we can love God just as well in the open air." Here is my reply: "If you love someone very much and you want to know him very well, don't you want to see him in his own house? It's very pleasant to have some picnics together in the open air, on a fine day, but is that the same thing as enjoying an intimate talk with your friend in his own home? So if you want to know and talk to God who loves you, talk to Him in His own house on the day He loves best; you may only go to see Him once a month and the other Sundays you may picnic with Him, but do make a point of going to church regularly, if not often, and you will find that God will be waiting for you."

Now I had another problem. One of my children wished to attend an Anglo-Catholic service and one liked a very simple ritual. What did I do? I taught them that it was really immaterial to which service they went. What mattered was that one service was not opposing the other, that both were right, both were worshipping God to the best of their ability, the difference being that while one person found God nearer to him through the music, incense and rich vestments of the Anglo-Catholic service, the other worshipped better in the quietness and tranquillity of the old-fashioned type of service.

They understood, so I hope and pray that if I am sincere and worship truly, my children will grow up in the knowledge and love of Jesus Christ.

A SUNNY SUNDAY MORNING

It is a fine Sunday morning; the broad space before the village church is rapidly filling with cars. The church bells are calling, and not in vain, for this is not the empty church as visualized by the Press, but the ordinary Sunday morning

congregation of a semi-suburban village in Buckinghamshire. Come inside with me; the bells have stopped and the service is about to commence. The choir enters, we rise, then the white-haired clergyman kneels in prayer and we kneel too.

"Dearly beloved brethren." The service has started. See how the sun lights up the gold on the altar cross. The second lesson is over, a hymn is sung, Ancient and Modern, of course! and we settle down to listen to the sermon.

The vicar preaches no learned discourse; he is no born orator; he just stands in the pulpit and talks to his people as though he were their father and as though he loves them, and this is right, for he has been with them many years, and is much loved and loves in return. He does not talk for long, the sun is still shining and he knows it; the last hymn is sung, the Blessing given, and we file out. But not all leave; as we go we notice that a few people are remaining, and we turn again to the altar to see kneeling before it in prayer the white-haired priest, the sun lighting up the red and black of his hood. It is a picture that writes itself indelibly on our minds; for who can say that Christ is no longer on this sinful earth when all over this England of ours in numberless small villages God is being worshipped in like manner? In spite of cars, golf-links, bathing and other attractions, there are thousands of people, young and old, who worship in their parish church every Sunday, and in spite of unpleasant notoriety of a few, there are many parish priests, loved and respected by their people, never before the eye of the public, but truly and honestly leading their flock in prayer and the worship of God in Christ.

ROBERT BOYLE (1626-1691), THEOLOGIAN AND SCIENTIST

THE majority of people may remember Robert Boyle as a man of science, but he had another absorbing interest in his life, and that was theology, upon which it has been said he bestowed "attention as earnest as if it had been undivided."

The Honourable Robert Boyle was the seventh son and fourteenth child of Richard Boyle, the "great" Earl of Cork, by his second wife, Catherine.

He was born at Lismore, Munster, on January 25, 1626, and the entry of his birth in his father's diary ends with the words "God bless him, for his name is Robert Boyle." He was

brought up to endure hardships and to enjoy, as he said later, "the passions of the air."

Sir Henry Wotton was Provost when Robert Boyle was at Eton, and of his father's friend Boyle wrote that he was "not only a fine gentleman himself, but very well skilled in the art of making others so." After four years at Eton, his education was continued under tutors at Stalbridge, Dorsetshire, and on the Continent. At this time, when he was fourteen years of age, Thomas Birch, in his *Life of Robert Boyle*, tells us that "he dated his conversion, or that express dedication to religion from which he never afterwards varied."

He returned to England in June, 1644, and to the confusion of civil war. He lived for some time at Stalbridge, and then in 1654 he went to Oxford and took lodgings near University College. For several years he had been a member of the "Invisible College" the precursor of the Royal Society, and now at Oxford there were inaugurated those delightful gatherings of philosophers and scientists. John Wallis, Clerk to the Westminster Assembly, the physician Jonathan Goddard, Christopher Wren, and Seth Ward, later to become Bishop of Exeter, were among those who joined Boyle in the discussions and experiments which took place in his rooms or in the laboratory which he had built.

The aim of this article is to show something of Boyle's theological and philosophical habit of mind, and for this purpose one of his works, *Occasional Reflections*, published in 1665, has been selected. The reader is called upon to share in the delights of Boyle's life as Squire of Stalbridge. He looked out on life with the reverent and delicate perception of one who was both a theologian and a scientist. He possessed a happy ingenuity of expression, and his "pretty conceits" illuminate the (apparently) ordinary incidents of everyday life. To him every creature and event which touched man's life had a Divine significance or a special message. Yet Boyle was in no sense a pantheist.

As students of theology it is to his *Reflections* we may turn for a refreshingly original theory with regard to meditation. He addressed the book to "My dearest Sister." This was Katherine, Viscountess Ranelagh, to whom he gave the name of Sophronia.

Far from limiting meditation to a specific period each day, Boyle advocated what may be termed a permanent attitude of mind whereby a man might combat the dangers of idleness and the attacks of his "Ghostly Adversary," for "he that is vers'd in making Reflections upon what occurs to him; He that (consequently) has the works of Nature, and the actions of

Men . . . to set his Thoughts on work . . . And he that can (as it were) make the World vocal, by furnishing every Creature, and almost every occurrence, with a Tongue to entertain him with, and can make the little Accidents of his Life, and the very Flowers of his Garden, read him Lectures of Ethicks or Divinity; such a one, I say, shall scarce need to fly to the Tavern . . . to help him to get rid of his time."

Before proceeding to his subjects for meditation, Boyle gently disposes of the various objections that might be brought against his system. Most practising Catholics have had to confess to the difficulty of making regular meditation, but to Boyle this is an added spur to the habit. He gives instances of other employments, such as Hunting and Hawking, which are doubly attractive to sportsmen because of the difficulties to be surmounted in their pursuit.

The purpose of Reflection is not subtilty of wit, but *piety*, a noble word that expresses all that was finest in the Roman character, and Robert Boyle most certainly attained to that high-mindedness and sobriety of outlook. Baron von Hügel's idea of "creatureliness" was characteristic of Boyle's love of life. All the faculties of the mind were to be brought into play, and although Boyle was an earnest theologian, he realized that the subject of meditation need not necessarily relate "to matters Devout, or Theological."

For example, he looks at a little sun-dial "furnished with an excited needle" as used by mariners to determine not only the time but also the direction of the wind. The fascination of magnetism led on to a comparison between the needle and the choice of companions. A man's choice of friends is a test of character and shows the working of his mind, for he will tend to assimilate the customs of those people whose companionship he has chosen. Boyle makes a clear distinction between the part which force of circumstance plays in acquaintanceship and the choice of companions. One result of this reflection may be summed up in the words of an old contemplative, who said that he never went among men but he returned home less a man than when he went forth.

Having considered the advantages that occasional meditations may have upon the intellectual faculties, Boyle proceeds to discuss the benefits that may accrue to the will and affections. The works of Providence and of God's creatures were to be to the meditator as an open book, full of lore which awaited his research, for when a man "looks about him in the world, he will find it, what one of the Fathers loftily styled it: *παιδευτηρίον τῆς Θεογνωσίας καὶ φευχῶν λογικῶν διδασκαλίον*.

And again he says: "When (once) . . . the Soul has attain'd

that desirable Frame we lately call'd Heavenly mindedness, which is a Disposition and a Readiness to make spiritual uses of Earthly things, both the Advantage and the Delight of that frame of heart cannot but be extraordinary. It must surely afford a great deal of satisfaction to an Ingenious and Devout person, to be able to make the world both his Library and his Oratory."

Boyle employs a very striking illustration when he censures those people who, fearing to be alone, plan out their days so that no times of solitude may intervene. He is describing the thoughts that came to him when he lay sleepless at night. "There is," he says, "a sort of Jolly people . . . who are at utter defiance with Thinking and . . . fear to be alone." For them a time of sickness is the only corrective, but, he quaintly urges, "that Sickness does little or nothing towards the making such Men consider by casting them upon their Beds, unless it also hinder them from sleeping there."

This is a significant thought for the darkness and solitude of those sleepless hours, and it may be compared to a more recent book, designed for Religious, wherein the writer says of the night hours: "We can then let the withdrawal of our souls be as complete as our outward severance from the world, and seek Him with our whole heart's desires, undistracted."

Robert Boyle loved country life, and these reflections may be regarded as a meditative diary, for in them we can follow the writer as he rides along the Dorset lanes, wanders in the fields with his spaniel, or angles by the side of the river.

His affection for his spaniel is shown by two subjects for meditation: the first "Upon my Spaniel's carefulness not to lose me in a strange place," and the second "Upon my Spaniel's fetching me my Glove." In the former reflection Boyle contrasts the condition of familiarity, in places and surroundings, which creates a temptation to wander from "our great Master," but when deprived of these "seducing rivals," the affections become single-eyed in their aim.

His delight in country life finds further expression in several reflections contained in the fourth section, "which treats of Angling Improv'd to Spiritual Uses." His thoughts on "Being call'd upon to rise early on a very fair Morning," for the purpose of a day's fishing, lead on to an appreciation of the joy and freshness of those early hours, the delicate greenery of fields and trees, the mounting and singing of larks, the walk through meadows and over ploughed fields to the river where the fish are only too willing to rise to the angler's bait!

To one member of the party, the mounting of the larks and their return to earth was an irresistible opportunity for com-

paring such movements with those of the hypocrite who so successfully deludes himself and others into a false conception of his personal sanctity. But his return to secular affairs is the means of unveiling his pious pretensions.

Many other reflections remain for the reader to study for himself and to enjoy the quaint turns of thought which Boyle delights in.

No more fitting conclusion can be made than by quoting Antony à Wood's testimony to the beauty of Robert Boyle's life and character as shown forth in his works: "The books that he hath written are many. . . . In them you'll find the greatest strength and the genteelest smoothness, the most generous knowledge and the sweetest modesty, the noblest discoveries and the sincerest relations, the greatest self-denial and the greatest love of men, the profoundest insight into philosophy and nature, and the most devoute, affectionate sense of God and of religion, as in any works whatsoever written by other men."

M. P. CRIGHTON.

THREE WAYS, OR ONE?

It has long been a commonplace amongst mystical writers that the life of Christian devotion moves along three ways, or paths, or stages, usually described as (a) the purgative, (b) the illuminative, and (c) the unitive—or perfective or contemplative. Bonaventura is often credited with having fixed the terminology of this tradition, and he connects the triple way with the dogma of the Trinity, subdividing each way into three methods, and each method into three degrees of attainment. But the seeds of this mode of presentation go back much further. The Franciscan doctor confesses his debt to the anonymous writer, supposed to be Dionysius the Areopagite, through whom more than any other the negative way of Oriental devotion came to be assimilated by the mediæval mystics. This Asiatic mysticism placed union with God as an ultimate goal to be reached after a long journey, and it began, continued, and ended mainly in denials. Dean Inge, in his Bampton Lectures, has shown that the negative road was at first intellectual, and more or less harmless, till its confession of our ignorance and of the incomplete character of all our knowledge passed into a refusal to make any positive statements whatsoever about God. Such agnosticism is apt to breed a race of mono-maniacs. Indian mysticism, being devoid altogether of the category of personality,

tends inevitably to pantheism. The Dean describes it as "the natural refuge of men who have lost faith in civilization, but will not give up faith in God." And he asks that "Panentheism," a word coined by Krause, should become the descriptive term of the Christian metaphysic.

And now there comes from an American humanist a volume which has been described as "a devastating attack on mysticism"! Dr. P. E. More's criticism has not yet received the attention which it deserves. For he assails, not the devotional life, but that perverted formulation of devotional experience which has resulted from following Plotinus and the pseudo-Dionysius, and regarding them as masters and experts above the writers in the New Testament. Dr. More's treatment is necessarily in the main destructive. He has little to say that is positive, save in incidental phrases, while he is vigorously breaking the idol to pieces. But his critique is of importance, because it lays bare the source of the trouble which infected much of the devotional thinking of Mediævalism. He analyzes unsparingly the inconsistencies and illogicalities of mystical treatises, tracing them back to the impact of Oriental mysticism on the Christian Church. Mysticism, as he understands it, is therefore described as "a disease of religion, the demon of the Absolute." He insists that the interpretation of spiritual experience has been vitiated by false philosophies, which in turn have reacted unfavourably on devotional methods and practices. A sentence may be quoted as typical of his standpoint. St. John of the Cross's description of the "theopathic" state, reached at the end of the third or unitive way, is characterized by Dr. More as "another aspect of the regular oscillation of the mystic goal between absolute transcendentalism and absolute pantheism . . . merely a Christian cosmetic applied to the grey-hued One of Plotinus."

Now this criticism may be devastating, but it is also somewhat refreshing, as it clears the ground historically, and may help to set the lists for the modern combat. As Dr. More points out, it is our estimate of the mystic goal, the content of the final way, that determines our critical reaction. Are we to continue to think that union with God involves "sinking into some formless Absolute," attained toward the close of a life of detachment and mortification? Or can we begin here and now to follow Christ, and claim union with Him as a present reality of possession? Some analysis of the intellectual background of the devotional life seems to be required, in order to preserve it from non-Christian accretions. If the threefold way presents a mistaken picture of the *scala perfectionis*, is there any other framework within which the mystical pro-

cesses, the stages of spiritual experience, can be exhibited in a manner more in accord with Catholic tradition? Must the uninstructed Christian be left at the mercy of any devotional treatise which he may pick up, and which happens to "find" him at some particular moment, and to interpret some particular element in his spiritual consciousness? Or can we discover a solid and objective basis in the fact of Christ and His Church, which is able to give room for all the varied phases of devotional activity and at the same time keep them loyal to the distinctive genius of our religion?

An answer is forthcoming out of the witness borne by the Catholic Church down all the centuries. F. D. Maurice used to say that, whereas the heathen religions were a story of man's quest after God, the Christian religion together with its Jewish predecessor contained the history of God's quest after men. In his *Letters to a Quaker* (happily recalled to us by Father Hebert in his recent book on *Intercommunion*), Maurice pointed to Baptism and the Eucharist, the New Testament, the Catholic creeds, and the Apostolic ministry as being signs of a Divine Constitution, a moral and spiritual Order, prepared for redeemed humanity, and manifesting the true and proper state of affairs for all things human. They all speak of a Divine Initiative, and of inexhaustible treasure now available for all who are ready to enter upon their Christian heritage. Nowhere in the New Testament is there anything about a threefold way. It declares One Way, the one and only Way of our Lord Himself, and the way of salvation opened up in His Church. Out of the formative period in the story of our religion there emerges the Catholic Church, presenting to us the fact of Christ as the sole Mediator between Heaven and earth, tabernacled amongst us, and come now through His Spirit to dwell within that human nature which He has redeemed. It is with our devotional response to this Divine initiative that the Christian mystics are really engaged. Molinos was audacious enough to deny the threefold way, and to assert that there was only one—viz., the internal. And the apprehension of the external as internal has always been the starting-point of mystical religion. "The great mystery of the Gospel," as Cudworth wrote, "does not lie in Christ outside us only—though we must also know what He has done for us—but the very pith and kernel of it consists in Christ found inwardly in our hearts." Saul of Tarsus describes his own conversion as a discovery of the Christ within, and spoke of his distinctive task as the proclamation to the Gentiles of the indwelling Christ. He is fond of the term "mystery," as illustrative of the new relationship between God and man. And he conceives of the human side of it, not

as a mere aggregate of individualistic ventures, but as the movement of a great fellowship of souls united one to another in virtue of their union with an unseen Lord. To him the ultimate vision for mankind, in Dean Inge's phrase, "is not the emptiness of undifferentiated Godhead, but the fullness of human stature in Christ." And it is to be attained through the growth of that Society which is "His Body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all."

Moreover, if mystics are those who tell us about mysteries, there are certain historic facts in our religion which the Church elevated long ago into great annual commemorations, and which as such have long enshrined the outstanding mysteries of the Gospel. In our Prayer Book the word "mystery" is not often applied to them. The Obsecrations in the Litany—"by the mystery of the Holy Incarnation," etc.—which seem to have sprung out of the same circles of devotion which gave us the Rosary, are still wanting in balance, laying disproportionate emphasis on some of the earlier items, and not making sufficient differentiation between some of the later ones, and even including the Resurrection and the Ascension in a single phrase. This lack of proportion appears to be a deep-rooted mistake. As the Bishop of Lincoln demonstrated, in his *Fullness of Sacrifice*, for many a long century there was a tendency to make so much of the Crucifixion that its sequel was thrown comparatively into the shade. It is unfortunate that Father Conran's Chaplet perpetuates this mistaken classification, dismissing the Resurrection as but one item of five among the glorious mysteries, and not allowing both the Resurrection and the Ascension to have the same weight, nor giving to the latter a distinctive title. The great festivals, which the Church has been led to observe, have long stood as a corrective to sectionalism and partiality. They speak of four great mysteries, which might perhaps be described as (a) the joyful discovery, (b) the sorrowful fact, (c) the glorious secret, and (d) the triumphant call. And the disciple follows, not in hope of some far distant goal, but by grasping the riches of a present blessing. We, like the Christ, have to have our miraculous birth, ushering us into the new world, where we find an atmosphere around us which we have to learn how to breathe and enjoy, charged as it is with the new powers and forces which He has brought into play around us. We, like the Christ, have to die and rise again, die a daily death by the confession of our sins and shortcomings, and rise every morning to newness of life in an effort to amend our ways. And, because we are risen with Christ, we have also to ascend with Him, ever seeking the things above, and reconstructing our values in accordance with His Mind.

What William Law called "the process of Christ" has to be re-enacted within the individual disciple. Each of the great moments in our Lord's life has to rehearse itself before the consciousness of the believer, not once, but again, and again, and yet again. Each act has to find its counterpart within us, and to evoke its own characteristic response in our spiritual experience.

For the venture of faith must have something to go upon. Spiritual exploration is not for us a quest in the clouds, but rests upon the corporate experience of the Catholic fellowship of Christendom, itself the product of the historic drama of our redemption. The fact of Christ is a thing given. His birth and death, His resurrection and ascension, are facts, objective realities, things which happened once in space and time. Faith did not create these facts, and does not create them now: it is only receptive of that which is already there.

"Though Christ a thousand times
In Bethlehem be born,
If He's not born in thee
Thy soul's forlorn.

"The Cross on Calvary
Can never save the soul;
The Cross in thine own heart—
That makes thee whole."

Every miracle of our faith is a parable fraught with mystic meaning. But that is not the same thing as to maintain that the parable gave rise to the miracle, and that all miraculous events are nothing more than spiritual lessons. Modernists may speak of the Gospels as an allegory, a psychological drama, an attempt to describe in objective imagery the story of the subjective experience of the Christian. But the Modernist must weigh carefully what are the essential characteristics of the Christian consciousness, before he can pronounce with confidence about its origin. The Church believes that in Jesus mankind has obtained not simply an inspiration for moral effort, but a fresh start by which ideals can be realized. His arrival amongst us has put humanity into a new position, to which the ordinances of His Church are ever bearing witness. Her message is not simply that "Jesus lives." Such a statement might be made, in a sense, about Socrates or Shakespeare or any of the prophets. Her faith, and it has been her faith from the beginning, is that "Jesus is Lord" and that "Christ is risen." The resurrection of the Son of Man, followed by His ascension and the gift of the Spirit, carries with it the resurrection not only of the souls of men but of human nature as a whole. And if it be true that mankind got a fresh start

through the arrival of the Lord, who wrapped our nature around Him and has enthroned it in the Being of God, then His birth of a Virgin and that resurrection of His flesh and bones which left the tomb empty both form integral elements in the Church's creed.

We, then, have to be born with Christ, to die and rise again with Him, and also to ascend. The great facts reproduce themselves within us, as we learn to follow Christ along the mystic path. Do they not cover the whole *gamut* of devotional experience? Do not the four central facts which, vitalized by the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost, are the outstanding commemorations of the Church's year, exhibit that which is involved in the One Foundation? And do not the joyful and the sorrowful, the glorious and the triumphant mysteries, provide the unchanging basis upon which the entire edifice of Christian devotion can be built?

Perhaps there is something British and insular in this plea. W. Law wrote: "The Temple of God is within thee, where alone thou canst worship in spirit and in truth: in spirit, because thy spirit is that alone within thee which can unite and cleave unto God, and receive the working of the Divine Spirit upon thee: in truth, because this adoration in spirit is that truth and reality of which all outward forms and rites, though instituted of God, are but the figure for a time. . . . Accustom thyself, therefore, to this service in this inward temple. There the birth, the life, the sufferings, the Death, the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus are not merely remembered, but inwardly found and enjoyed as real states of thy soul." Julian of Norwich represented our Lord as encouraging her to pray by telling her: "I am the ground of thy beseechings. First, it is My Will that thou shouldest have it; then, I make thee to wish for it; and then I make thee to beseech it, and so thou doest." And she added: "Highly ought we to enjoy that God dwelleth in our soul, but much more highly that our soul dwelleth in God." The Divine initiative, as the master element, seems to have had a special appeal to English devotion.

And the twin Sacraments indicate how the Catholic Church supplies the area upon which the fact of Christ is to be apprehended. As Julian noted, the truth that Christians are in Christ is even more eloquent than that Christ is in them. Some day the Font will receive far greater attention amongst us. The new birth, as an alteration of status, the gift of a new spiritual position, will be acknowledged as the prime herald of the Gospel. Our response to it will be interpreted, in the language of our Christmas hymns, as the joyful discovery of the Christ born again in us. Baptism places us once for all in

Christ, and then at the altar He comes to cement afresh a union that has already been established. The Epistle, speaking of the indwelling Christ or the fruits of His indwelling, comes before the Gospel which pictures Him objectively before us. And the Eucharistic act is linked with the Ascension rather than with the Crucifixion. *Sursum Corda* has always been the keynote of the rite. And while the West has tended to regard it as a coming down of Heaven to earth, the East has been more faithful to its permanent appeal as a lifting up of earth to Heaven. The Eucharist is no casual Theophany, but the crowning manifestation of that moral and spiritual Order which has its living centre in our Lord Himself. Not the sorrowful, but the triumphant mystery, is always the call from the altar. And to this structural climax of our faith we are introduced by that Baptism which opens the door to everything. In the words of the late Principal Caird, "In that act which constitutes the beginning of the religious life, call it faith or trust or self-surrender, there is involved an identification of the finite with a life that is eternally realized. It is true that the religious life is progressive: but it is progress, not towards, but within the sphere of the Infinite. It is not the vain attempt by endless finite increments to become possessed of infinite wealth, but the endeavour to appropriate by the constant exercise of spiritual activity that infinite inheritance of which we are already in possession."

H. T. KNIGHT.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES

THE ORTHODOX AND THE ANGLICAN CHURCHES

DISCUSSIONS between different bodies of Christians often bring back into prominence questions which, like sleeping dogs, people have agreed to leave on one side.

Such are some of the questions raised by Professor N. Arseniev in the September THEOLOGY. They may be arranged under three heads: (a) The Filioque. (b) The Black Rubric, and certain words in the Thirty-nine Articles. (c) The Sufficiency of Holy Scripture.

We need not stop now to consider (a), further than to say that the same cause—loyalty to the form in which the Nicene Creed has been received—which impels the Easterns to reject the Filioque, impels us to retain it. Perhaps a way out might be found if we agreed, when reciting the Creed in Latin or English, to insert it; but in Greek, to omit it.

With regard to (b) it is a question of the difficulty of getting rid of outworn formulæ. Differences have arisen in times past, and it has been found possible at the time to settle them by formulæ, which were then thought to safeguard what each side valued. However, the lapse of time has in some cases softened the keen edge of controversy; in others it has altered the meanings of words, and sometimes has made sentences unintelligible. Sometimes, indeed, the formulæ themselves were never quite grammatical or lucid, made up as they were of combinations of sentences, such as were valued, some by one side, some by the other, but not always as a whole, by either.

The Black Rubric was originally undoubtedly heretical (put forward by Protestant Reformers, in a version of the Book of Common Prayer which was never authorized by the Church); afterwards the worst sentence was altered, making the whole almost meaningless. Most of us had thought that, having served its purpose, it could now well be forgotten, and in the 1927 Revision it was displaced. However, such an outcry was made by some who, truth to tell, did not seem really to know what it meant, that the 1928 Revision brought it back again.

The Thirty-nine Articles were approved by both sides, and were intended to display the limits to which the comprehensiveness of the English Church, as then reformed, could reach. They are no longer of value for this purpose, and ought to be dropped: but neither side is prepared at present to face the odium of denouncing them. At the same time, were such statements to be drawn up today, they would be so worded as to be approved by the Eastern Churches.

(c) The Sufficiency of Holy Scripture is a phrase coined originally to prove to ourselves, and also to Protestant Reformers, how much greater is the value which we place on Holy Scriptures than that which Rome places on them, but the rise of Fundamentalism in the present century, as well as the prevalent Criticism (against which it is a reaction), have shaken considerably the Protestant position. The effect on members of our Church is that some of them are not quite sure of their position, and would not readily accept any unfamiliar definitions.

Thus in both (b) and (c) it would much facilitate agreement if the representatives of the Eastern Churches were to formulate definite statements on points about which they require information. If they were to say, We believe so and so, they would probably find Anglicans would agree, whereas a statement from our side on any of them would be unsatisfactory; we should have to take into account the suspicions that would be aroused in certain quarters, at anything which seemed like throwing over ancient formularies, however worn out we, in our hearts, know them to be. Moreover any statements coming from the Eastern Churches would not be liable to the suspicion that they were unduly favourable to any party in the Anglican Church.

One must be careful, too, not to rouse the suspicions of those who are not well instructed, but this is a difficulty to be found not in the English Church only; though it is certainly a foible of Englishmen to adopt compromises, which seem to settle matters for a time, but in the long run are often troublesome, and difficult to get rid of.

HEBERT DRAKE.

THE ASCRIPTION

I

Within living memory the Invocation, "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," has ousted a prayer as the normal prelude to a sermon. In recent years a custom, peculiar I think to Anglicans, has grown up, of repeating the Invocation at the close of the sermon.* I have been unable to trace the origin of this innovation, which most strangely has become a hall-mark of "Catholicism." A friend writes as follows:—

"We have all got so much into the way of it that it seems the obvious thing to say . . . I expect it began with the general dislike of the stiff Anglican tradition. Probably those who first used it had no idea how venerable tradition was in this particular. Of course Stanton had immense influence in leading people to hate anything which sounded pompous. Anything which was both Roman and simple would have great attractions for priests in this frame of mind."

II

In the Jewish synagogue the sermon was a solemn liturgical exercise, ending with a prayer (later expanded into the *Kaddish*) and the ascription: "May the great name be blessed for ever and ever."† It is reasonable to suppose that our Lord and His Apostles followed the prevailing custom. Romans ix.-xi. looks like a sermon on "The Rejection of Israel," composed in the *diatribe* style, which St. Paul has inserted at this point. It has no connection with ch. viii. and is a self-contained unit within the Epistle.‡ The section ends: "To him be the glory for ever. Amen." Similarly the first three chapters of Ephesians are composed in homiletical style and end: "Unto him be the glory in the church and in Christ Jesus unto

* Roman Catholic friends tell me that it is customary to use the Ascription if a formula is desired, but it is usually dispensed with.

† G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i. 306.

‡ See C. H. Dodd's *Commentary*.

all generations for ever and ever. Amen." The Jewish formula has become almost Trinitarian.

The Epistle to the Hebrews has a short epistolary conclusion, following the main body of the work, which is described as a sermon or "word of exhortation" (xiii. 22). The whole treatise, omitting these last verses, takes the form of a rhetorical course of sermons, which ends: "The God of peace . . . make you perfect . . . in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen."

The First Epistle of Peter is often thought to be a baptismal homily, or series of homilies, used as a circular letter with a brief epistolary appendix. The homily proper ends with: "To him be the dominion for ever and ever. Amen." The Second Epistle gives the glory to Christ—"to him be the glory both now and for ever. Amen." The fullest doxology of all is that which ends the Epistle of Jude.

So far as literary structure goes, there is no clear dividing line between the canonical 2 Peter and Jude and a sub-apostolic writing like the so-called Second Epistle of Clement. All three documents contain homiletical material within the framework of an Epistle. "Second Clement" ends with a noble Doxology: "To the only Invisible God, the father of truth, who sent forth to us the Saviour and prince of immortality, through whom He also made manifest to us truth and the light of heaven, to Him be the glory for ever and ever. Amen." To this someone has appended the words: "The Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians."

The First Epistle of Clement contains, as is well known, liturgical matter and general instruction in homiletic form besides the admonitions designed for the situation at Corinth. The writer apparently uses existing sermon material. Indeed the Doxologies, which occur at regular intervals—at the end of chapters 20, 32, 38, 44, 50, 58, 61, 64—may give us the clue to the various addresses of the course of sermons incorporated by the writer.

The great Fathers naturally continued the custom; by their time the formula was fully Trinitarian. Thus St. Chrysostom ends usually with: "To whom be glory and might, for ever and ever"; often with a mention of Jesus Christ, "to whom be glory and might, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, world without end. Amen." St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Basil, and many others might be cited.

In England we may note Colet's Convocation Sermon on February 6, 1512, ending: ". . . unto God, unto whom be all honour and glory for evermore. Amen." Latimer rings the changes, concluding now with an ascription, now with a prayer, such as "and so attain to everlasting life: to the which the Father of heaven bring you and me." The homilies in every case but one have the Ascription at the end of the complete sermon, sometimes also at the end of each part.

III

To conclude with some practical suggestions. The traditional preface to the English sermon is a prayer. It goes back to the Bidding of the Bedes in the Prone and is prescribed by Canon 55, which orders the Bidding Prayer "in this form, or to this effect," to be said, "always concluding with the Lord's Prayer." In most parish churches the Invocation has supplanted the prayer. When the preacher appears in the pulpit the impulse is to sit. He wishes the congregation, who have been standing

for the Creed or a hymn, to sit as soon as possible, and so avoids the change of posture caused by kneeling; Anglicans do not take readily to standing for prayer.

The Invocation is a solemn liturgical formula, appropriate on the lips of the authorized dispenser of God's word and Sacraments. It is associated with Baptism and teaching in St. Matthew xxviii. 19 and, using it as we do at Baptism, we naturally transfer it to the occasions when we teach "them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you." The meaning is: "I stand before you to proclaim the word of God in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Admirable as an exordium, it is out of place as a climax. At the outset the preacher announces his credentials. The only worthy conclusion is not to repeat them but to ascribe the glory to God, as in the Psalms and prayers.

An objector may say: "I don't want to be so formal as all that." Very well, let him dispense with formality if he prefers, though so sacred a thing as the sermon should not end just anyhow, as if the preacher were saying "that's all for today"; we are all tempted at times to take sermons lightly and the tremendous seriousness of the Ascription is a safeguard against flippancy. But if we have a formula at all, it should surely be that hallowed by the immemorial tradition of the Church, not a modern invention.

An alternative ending is a prayer; but this, too, will inevitably end with a Trinitarian formula.

The unconscious motive for repeating the Invocation is probably the desire to escape the noise caused by the rising of the congregation. It would be a simple matter to tell them to remain seated; indeed it is more reverent to listen to the solemn words seated than to drown them in a universal stir. Further, there is no authority for beginning "And now . . ." In our models the preacher concludes his sermon with a mention of God or Jesus Christ, adding as part of the sentence "to whom . . ."

All this applies especially to the sermon as ordered in the Prayer Book as part of the Eucharist. On other occasions informality is legitimate, if it really conduces to the salvation of men and the glory of God.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

CORRESPONDENCE

February 27, 1933.

DEAR SIR,

Now that my letter which appeared in *THEOLOGY* for October last has received replies both from yourself in the same number and from the Bishop of Colombo in the current number (February), may I again trespass on your space in order to carry the discussion a step further? My excuse must be the importance of the issues raised, which I am sure we all recognize.

While I am genuinely grateful both to the Bishop and to yourself for taking so much trouble to answer me, may I at the outset express some disappointment that my letter has been treated as a statement of certain views which I am supposed to be defending, whereas my letter was carefully phrased so as not to state or defend any view at all, but merely to define certain alternatives and to ask certain questions based

on them? The result is that the main question I asked has not been noticed. My letter concluded as follows: "It is not enough to say that 'it is wrong in principle to depart from the Anglican rule that the celebrant of the Holy Communion is to be a priest,' when the whole question of principle concerns the meaning of the rule, and the ground and scope of the obligation which it imposes. What are they?" The only answer I have received is, briefly, that an Anglican must on no account depart from the rule, since from the beginning it has belonged to the essential order and constitution of the Catholic Church. As to the *meaning* of the rule, which was the principal point in my question, nothing has been said.

As, therefore, I am not allowed to ask questions without being treated as the upholder of certain strange and erroneous doctrines supposed to be implied in them, may I try shortly to answer my own question, and to state the opinion which really does underlie it? I grant entirely that it is essential to Catholic order that the celebrant of the Holy Communion must be an episcopally ordained priest, and that therefore, of course, the Anglican Church is bound by this rule. But what does this statement *mean*? "Must" is an essentially ambiguous word, and it is well recognized among scholastic theologians (who at least have the virtue of precision) that an outward or sacramental sign may be *necessary* in either of two senses, either *necessitate medii* or *necessitate præcepti*: in the first case it is necessary *as a means*, in the second case it is necessary *because divinely ordained*.

Now I do not propose to follow scholastic theologians in the application of this distinction; but the distinction in ideas seems to me both important and relevant to the present issue. Granted that the episcopal ordination of the minister is "necessary" for the celebration of the Eucharist, it is still possible to raise the question whether it is necessary as a means, or simply because it is a divinely appointed rule for the Church. And it may make a vital difference which view we hold. For if the necessity be that "of a means," it follows that no sacrament celebrated in a non-episcopal body can be a veritable Eucharist at all. But if the necessity be that "of a precept," it would still be quite intelligible to maintain that even in a non-episcopal body the Eucharist can be truly celebrated, though not without breach of a divine ordinance. Of course such a breach must not be treated as a matter of indifference by those who recognize it as a breach; and surely Anglican Evangelicals, who would not affirm a divine precept in this matter, are nevertheless bound in practice by the rule of their Church as well as by respect for the conscience of their Anglo-Catholic brethren. But *no one* would be obliged in logic to suppose that, when a body of Christians, not recognizing a divine ordinance about ordination, in good faith celebrates a sacrament without observing it, the reality of the sacrament must therefore be annulled or even rendered doubtful.

I infer that both you, Sir, and the Bishop of Colombo are of opinion that episcopal ordination must be judged, at least probably, to be necessary to the Eucharist *necessitate medii*. It follows that the Churches uniting with ours under the South India Scheme are probably altogether without one of the two Sacraments affirmed in the Catechism to be "generally necessary to salvation" (*necessitate medii* again?). In that case, of course, it is quite intolerable to suggest that any Anglican, however cut off from the ministrations of his Church or whatever his need, might

partake of the Communion of a non-episcopal body, as though it were what it professed to be, the Sacrament of Christ's ordinance—and no honourable man would partake of it on any other assumption. I confess I find it hard to understand how such doctrine is reconcilable with any co-operation in the South India Scheme as a whole; but I must recognize that others think differently on this point. I must say, however, that it does not appear to me to ease the anomaly in the least to declare that we do not *deny* that certain non-episcopal bodies have the Eucharist, but are only doubtful whether they have it or not, so that for all practical purposes we must assume their lack of it. It seems to me that the directly negative line in doctrine is really more straightforward and more charitable. And the attitude of doubt reminds me uncomfortably of an answer once given to a question about the baptism of John.

On the other hand, if the necessity of episcopal ordination to the Eucharist is *necessitas præcepti*, a quite different line of thought and action becomes possible. We should then maintain that, when a minister not episcopally ordained celebrates the Eucharist, a breach of the divinely appointed order of the Church is perpetuated. Yet, for sufficient reasons based on our knowledge of God through Christ, we may still believe firmly that the breach has not annulled the reality of the Sacrament. In that case the general lines of the South India Scheme are clearly justifiable. It would seem at once legitimate to allow an Anglican who is permanently isolated from the ministrations of his own Church to receive communion in a body lacking the episcopate. And even the recent resolution of the South Indian Bishops about occasions of inter-communion, deplorable and disquieting as Anglo-Catholics must think it, need not surely be counted as absolutely barring the door to any further co-operation in the main Scheme.

I am now in a position to answer the question which you, Sir, asked me last October, whether I regard Baptism as necessary in one who celebrates the Eucharist. I should say, "Certainly, *necessitate præcepti*." I cannot reconcile it with my reason or my conscience to hold that in reference to particular questions of Church order, or even to the necessity of sacraments for individual salvation, *necessitas medii* really exists at all. Even the Roman Catholic Church has found it impossible to accept all its logical consequences. Certainly we may say that the Sacramental Church as a whole, with its general outward unity of order, is necessary *as the means* for the salvation of the world. The world (at least very likely) *cannot* be saved without it. That is why schism is such deadly sin. But surely when a Sacrament is regarded either as a means to salvation in the individual or as a means to the ministration of another Sacrament (as in the relation of Ordination to the Eucharist) the *necessity* lies not in the actual mediation of the second thing by the first, but solely in the obligation of the divine ordinance which has appointed the first thing as the means to the second. And, since all sacramental ordinances are appointed as means of giving grace and not of restricting it, we may and ought to presume, on sufficient grounds, that, where the obligation of a particular ordinance is in good faith not recognized, the result is nevertheless attained apart from the *appointed* means. I cannot help thinking that, if this principle were frankly recognized, some formidable obstacles in the path of reunion would be cleared away.

The real point at issue in this discussion concerns the nature and meaning of the necessity which connects episcopal ordination with the

Eucharist. We must beware of confounding the "moral" necessity to obey ordinances with the "physical" necessity which links necessary means to ends and causes to effects. And surely it will be agreed that in the last resort we must judge the obligation of outward ordinances by the Gospel of God in Jesus Christ, and not the Gospel by the obligation of the ordinances. Grace made the Sacraments; not the Sacraments grace.

I am,

Yours very truly,

OLIVER C. QUICK.

DEAR SIR,

My answer to Mr. Wyatt, which must be very brief, is this. I did not mean to suggest that no form of Consecration was valid unless the rite containing it were canonically enacted. But when, as in the case of the 1928 Book, the method of Consecration is altered, and is moreover ambiguous in itself, it seems to me that definite canonical enactment is necessary before we can feel perfect confidence in the validity of the Consecration. The doubt is a small one, but it is enough to cause discomfort. Can it really be maintained that 1928 is an official rite of the Church of England in the same sense as 1661?

Yours faithfully,

KENNETH D. MACKENZIE.

REVIEW

ZACARIAS GARCÍA VILLADA, S. J. HISTORIA ECLESIASTICA DE ESPAÑA. Tomo II. La iglesia desde la invasión de los pueblos germánicos en 409 hasta la caída de la monarquía visigoda en 711. (Primera parte.) Madrid. 1932. Pp. 347.

Students of Church History who welcomed, in 1929, the first volume of García Villada's important work have been wondering whether the recent troubles in Spain might not have delayed or altogether hindered its continuation. And that their apprehensions were very far from groundless appears in the poignant "Por via de prólogo," which the Jesuit scholar prefixes to the first part of his second volume, now at hand. The burning of the Catholic Institute of Arts and Crafts of Madrid, on May 11, 1931, involved for him the almost total loss of the fruits of twenty-nine years of study and research—"toda la vida mía." By great good luck he had sent the MS. of his second volume to the publisher only a few days before, and had entrusted that of the third volume to a friend, along with the notes necessary for his other great undertaking, the completion of the *Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Hispaniensis* begun by Loewe in 1870. That is much to be thankful for; and so, too, is the admirable fortitude of a great scholar who, in the face of so overwhelming a disaster, promises to continue the work which he has so well begun.

The present instalment of the *Historia eclesiastica* is of course uniform with the earlier parts, well printed on good paper, and comparatively free from typographical errors—although the inevitable table of Errata by no means corrects all of them. It is enriched with numerous maps and reproductions from early manuscripts, including a charming series of illuminations from an Escorial codex, illustrating incidents in the history of the period with which it is concerned: King Reccared addressing the Bishops at the 3rd Council of Toledo, King Recceswinth presenting his Tome at the 7th Council, Gregory the Great with Leander of Seville, etc. The maps, though useful, are somewhat amateurish.

The period covered extends from 409 to 711, but after the first few chapters the method is synthetical rather than chronological, on the model of Magnin's *L'Eglise wisigothique*, to which the author rightly assigns a high value, although he quarrels with some of the French scholar's conclusions. (By the way, when are we to have the second part of Magnin's work, which exists in manuscript?) Chapters are devoted in succession to the relations of Church and State, the relations of Spain and Rome, the controversy of the "Three Chapters," the Jewish problem, the hierarchy, the ecclesiastical divisions

of Spain—with here an interesting treatment of the “*iglesias propias*” or private churches, which presented so many problems to the Visigothic councils—the property of the Church, the Church courts, the education and life of the clergy, and the development of Spanish monasticism. If in all this there is little that is new to the student of Spanish Church history, it was no less worth while to bring together the scattered researches of other workers in the same field, especially as in Spain itself no such co-ordination has been undertaken in recent times. The writer, too, as a very eminent palæographer, has that exhaustive knowledge of the manuscript sources which, at one point and another, enables him to supplement the material hitherto available. A notable “find,” for example, is the text (given in Appendix I.) of what P. García very plausibly conjectures to be a fragment of the first *Apologeticum fidei* which Julian of Toledo sent to Pope Benedict, and which led to an exchange of asperities between the Spanish bishops and the Holy See. We are grateful, too, for the reminder that the Visigothic coronation rites, which Férotin thought to be irrecoverably lost, are embodied in the thirteenth-century *Rituale* of Cardena, published in Berganza’s *Antiquedades de España*. P. García describes these rites, but reserves further treatment of liturgical matters for the second half of his volume, which we cannot but hope will follow without undue delay; it should prove of quite unusual interest and importance.

In the volume under review there is very little which calls for adverse criticism, although one or two minor points are certainly open to question. For example, is the “judicium” addressed to “Johannes Defensor” by Pope Gregory the Great to be taken as showing the actual results of the former’s inquiry into the case of Januarius of Malaga, or only as a model to be followed by the inquisitor if the facts should turn out to be as alleged by Januarius? In this case, too, the appeal to Rome must not be pressed as an argument for Papalism; Malaga, at the time, was in the hands of the Byzantines and quite cut off from the normal organization of the Spanish Church. Again, can Canon 25 of Toledo IV.—“*sciant igitur sacerdotes scripturas sanctas et canones*”—be taken as requiring all bishops to learn the canons *by heart*? If so, by the same token, it requires them also to memorize the Holy Scriptures! These are details of little importance; more serious is the question of the relations between the Spanish Church and the Apostolic See. Our author is a little scandalized by Magnin’s imputations of “nationalism,” and he is at great pains to vindicate the papalism of the Visigothic bishops. But Magnin has the stronger case.

W. S. PORTER.

NOTICES

LAW AND LIFE ACCORDING TO HEBREW THOUGHT. By Joseph Yahuda, LL.B. Oxford University Press. 10s. 6d.

This is a very perplexing book to deal with because its methods are so entirely different from those which the student of the Old Testament is accustomed to employ. The aim of the author is stated to be "collecting, collating and combining a mass of facts, laws, legends, customs, statements and opinions which will help the student to arrive at some clear conclusion as to the guiding spirit in Hebrew thought" (p. 12). In carrying out this enquiry he confines himself to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments in the Authorized Version (often quoting long pieces verbatim) and to Talmudical tracts. There is no criticism of text or translation and very little attempt to date these Scripture texts. Next to no use is made of archaeological discoveries, and very little attention is paid to the *growth* of ideas and institutions. It is very noteworthy that there is not in the whole book one single reference to any modern author. We are further told that "no heed should be paid to beliefs and ideals entertained by the Children of Israel, other than those expounded by the Prophets and Rabbis, though other beliefs and ideals are known to have been cherished by a proportion, more or less large, of the people" (p. 3), and that "it is unnecessary to enquire here into the currents of foreign influence, or to try to trace them to their respective native sources" (p. 11). On such principles the student must throw away nearly all his tools before he begins his investigation. Mr. Yahuda does not seem to be conscious of any of the difficulties of his subject. We need only refer to his treatment of the very difficult and complicated question of Hebrew Monotheism (pp. 13-17). After stating that the characteristic of Abraham's tribe was the belief held by that tribe in the existence of one and only one God, he goes on to assert that Jewish life and thought were entirely shaped by this conception, and refers to St. Mark xii. 28-30. The fact is ignored that for centuries Jahweh was regarded only as a local and tribal deity like those of other nations (comp. Judg. xi. 24; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; 2 Kings v. 17-19), and that in addition nearly everyone worshipped the local Baals (Hos. ii. 5, 13, 17), as at a very late period many worshipped Gad and Meni (Isa. lxxv. 11). The treatment of this subject is quite inadequate, nor can we think that the question of the sacrificial law of Israel with its long history is sufficiently dealt with in these words: "Ezra and his colleagues seem to have thought that a bloody altar and an epicurean kitchen, housed in a magnificent temple, shrouded with clouds of incense, were the only justification, if not the only *raison d'être*, of a Jewish colony in Palestine" (p. 9). As Mr. Yahuda makes so large a use of the New Testament, we are naturally interested to know how he regards Our Lord. "Jesus had a perfect understanding of many tenets of Judaism and proved that the prophetic spark was not yet extinguished in Israel. But he succumbed to the Messianic epidemic of his time and remained an *enfant du siècle*" (p. 9). On the other hand when speaking of the improvement of the conditions of life: "That is the quintessence of the Messianic mission, and the systematic teaching thereof places Jesus amongst the foremost heralds of the Messianic ideal" (p. 63). But generally he sees our Lord as "a provincial Rabbi" (p. 4) and does not seem to feel

how different the *quality* of His teaching was from the casuistical futilities of the Rabbis and the Talmud.

Mr. Yahuda is seen more to advantage in those sections of the book which deal with the Civil and Criminal Law, the Status of Women Strangers and Slaves, and kindred subjects on which he makes many shrewd observations, illustrating them with a mass of rabbinical lore, often very interesting. But here again we note the absence of a careful criticism of the passages cited, or of their dates, or at what period or stage of progress the nation had arrived when they were written; and there seems a want of recognition of the fact that (especially in Deuteronomy) what looks like an enactment is often the statement of an ideal to be desired, but which may not be capable of being carried into effect. We miss, too, any reference to ancient codes such as that of Hammurabi, which would afford more help in illustrating primitive Hebrew laws than any opinions of Rabbis given hundreds of years later.

On the whole, for the reasons we have tried briefly to express, we do not think this work likely to be of great service either to the Old Testament scholar or to the Christian student.

W. W. CANNON.

THE RELIGION OF THE BAHÁ'IS. By J. R. Richards. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

I first came across Bahá'ism at Paris during the winter 1913-14, when I met Horace Holley, its American exponent. Horace Holley looked on me, as he no doubt looked on every fresh acquaintance, as a possible convert, and enthusiastically explained to me the new religion. It was, if I remember rightly, presented as an enlightened eclecticism, combining the spirituality of the East with the practical humanitarianism of the West. My attention was particularly drawn to a number of letters which Bahá'ú'lláh had addressed to the Pope and to the crowned heads of Europe. Had these great personages acted on the advice therein contained, all the problems of the nineteenth century, economic, personal and religious, would have been solved, and the twentieth century would have dawned cloudless and serene.

I respected Horace Holley for his enthusiasm, but he seemed to me, like many another earnest American, somewhat credulous. However, I did not feel the need for a new world-religion, and he did. We agreed to differ.

It must have been in the following summer that I discussed the new cult with Professor E. G. Browne at his house in Cambridge. Professor Browne referred to the religion as Bábism, in honour of the first prophet, the Bab, whose "New History" he gave to me. The Professor urged that Bábism should be judged from the Persian point of view. It was a plant grown on Mōhammedan soil, suited to its native land, but unfit to be transplanted.

Bahá'ism, as the later development of Bábism was called, had inspired much noble poetry in honour of Bahá'ú'lláh, the second and greatest of its prophets. Some of the Bahái hymns were sung to me with impassioned fervour by a young Persian friend of Professor Browne's. Personal adoration of Bahá'ú'lláh the beloved was their invariable theme.

I last heard of Bahá'ism when an American acquaintance of mine went to Haifa, which had become the headquarters of the sect, to study its tenets and to sit at the feet of any prophet there to be found. That was two

years ago, and I have had no word of her since. Professor Browne is dead, and with him died his unique understanding of the Persian character and spirit. If Horace Holley is still talking about Bahá'ism, no echo of his words has reached me. I was under the impression that the new "world-religion" had ceased to interest the West, though it survived as an obscure but worthy Persian sect.

Mr. Richards, a C.M.S. missionary at Shiraz, has, however, something more to say. Bahá'ism, to which he is from first to last uncompromisingly hostile, is superior to the crude forms of Mohammedanism, chiefly in its teaching with regard to the position of women and the desirability of international peace. For that very reason it is an obstacle to the spread of Christianity among Mohammedans.

Bahá'is, moreover, have a sly way of pretending to be earnest seekers after Christ, even to the point of receiving baptism, in order to spread Baháí doctrines among Christians. Mr. Richards wishes missionaries to be well armed to meet Bahá'is, and has accordingly written a detailed and well-informed account of the whole movement.

Baháí historians evidently consider facts as a chess player considers his pieces; they exist merely to be placed here or there as the exigencies of the game demand. Mr. Richards has had no light task in assigning to each fact its correct place, but he seems to have acquitted himself remarkably well.

Baháí history has its heights and its depths; its spiritual devotion, its martyrdoms, as well as its quarrels, slanders, and alas! the murder of one prophet at the instigation of another. To follow its many intricacies, to appraise the moral worth not only of the doctrines, but of the men who preached them, what insight, what acumen, what sympathy are needed! Mr. Richards marshalls his facts most ably, but is he not too hard on these half-educated but probably quite sincere men, the Báb Bahá'ú'lláh and Abdi'l Bábá? Would it not be kinder and more just to compare them with such prophets as Sabbatai, Zeir, Chaitanya, or Keshub Chunder Sen, rather than stress their manifest inferiority to our Lord Himself?

AELFRIDA TILLYARD.

CHRISTIANITY AND PHILOSOPHY. By D. Miall Edwards. T. and T. Clark. 10s. 6d.

Dr. Edwards sets out to construct an adequate philosophical framework for Christian conviction. As a "personal idealist" God to him must be the ultimate reality both of nature and the highest human values, and man cannot be less than spiritual personality capable of union with the ultimate Person. The philosophy sought must start from the highest values, will include all sense-experience as in a way sacramental, and cannot disdain religious experience. He refuses to set up "the Holy" as a fourth value beyond Truth, Beauty, and Morality, but makes it their *fons et origo*, out of which they are differentiations—each value in itself is a window opening to the Absolute. He does not unduly stress the present scientific reaction from Naturalism, though noting it as a portent; modern theories are carefully examined, so far as space allows, and Gentile and Croce dismissed as not providing any criterion either of the true or the good. He sees that Leibniz is the father of the notion of "the Graded universe," which is essential to his own view, and has been fully exploited by Dr. Temple and others.

A Graded universe leaves room for physical reality, and for an Idealism which respects everything on whatever lower grade it be; it leaves room for Christ, the summit of the progressive Incarnation of God, and unique as such. Mr. Galsworthy's *Forsyte Saga* is quoted with effect, where Jolyon sees in Christ the union of the creative principle and of "the sum of human altruisms."

As may be expected from this, Dr. Edwards cannot comfortably include under his philosophical ægis the orthodox formulæ either of the two natures in one Person or of the strictly ontological Trinity. He stands for a single human consciousness in Christ, "saturated with divinity," and up to a point follows Dr. Kirk in acknowledging three "activities" as "outstanding features of the divine self-giving, without committing ourselves to any redundant duplications or triplications of 'persons.'"

The merit of the book is its clearness and conciseness, and its loyalty to the implications of religious experience as the basis for the philosophy of religion. It is an interesting endeavour, and arouses respect for its acuteness and frankness, even where one disagrees with its conclusions.

W. J. FERRAR.

THE PEACE ARMY. By Henry Brinton. Williams and Norgate, Ltd.
2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d.

The theme of this little book lies in the suggestion conveyed by its title, namely the raising of an "army" of men pledged to unarmed intervention in the event of the League of Nations' failure to prevent the outbreak of a war. The Peace Army would be sent by a pacifist nation to occupy a line between the frontiers of the belligerent states. The result would be at the least to delay hostilities, and probably to bring them to a speedy end, if this heroic plan were seriously adopted. Better still, the existence of such an army would do much to prevent war, and would be a most powerful aid to peace propaganda. There are useful chapters on the failure of the laws of supply and demand in world economics ("the wages of economic sin"), and on the failure to secure the all-round reduction of armaments, which was stated to be one of the objects of the Treaty of Versailles. We hope the book will be widely read, as an attempt to apply the principles of our Lord to the present world situation.

J. H. McCUBBIN.

ST. PAUL. By Wilfred Knox. Peter Davies. 5s.

Father Knox's book is a short summary of St. Paul's career as it appears to him. There are no references to Biblical passages or to other scholars. He states dogmatically a number of disputable things, as that Our Lord's ministry began in 28 and lasted one year. The tone will appear to some readers unduly rationalistic. Thus the sending of Paul and Barnabas "by the Holy Ghost" in Acts xiii. appears as "the Antiochene Christians decided on a counterstroke" (p. 65). The Pastoral Epistles are explained by saying: "The Christians of Ephesus . . . with a wholly uncritical piety ascribed to him every scrap of ecclesiastical literature of unknown origin on which they could lay their hands" (p. 133). In an appendix Fr. Knox refers readers to his larger book on St. Paul for a justification of the views here propounded.

If a theologian is inclined to be critical, let him reflect upon the diffi-

culties of writing such a book. It forms one of a series of biographies otherwise secular and is intended to interest educated non-theological readers. As such it could hardly be better done. Under-statement in such cases is the truest *apologia*; piety would be out of place. The sense of proportion, the power of compression, the firm style, the avoiding of the mistakes almost inevitable in such a brief treatment, are all masterly.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE WAKE OF THE SOUTHERN CROSS. By the Rt. Rev. Cecil Wilson.
John Murray. 10s. 6d.

The recent wreck, involving its total loss, of the latest *Southern Cross* off Anaityum in the New Hebrides, on her maiden voyage to the islands, has drawn the sympathetic attention of the whole Church to the Melanesian Mission and its glorious, if tragic, history; and we know of no better account of "work and adventures in the South Seas" within the Diocese of Melanesia than that contained in this book, the work of one who was himself Bishop of the Diocese for some seventeen years, following as such John Selwyn, himself the successor of Patteson. The story is written after many years, yet told so vividly as to give the impression of things that happened but yesterday and were retained fresh and living in the memory; and the reader is carried forward from chapter to chapter by the simplicity of the style, the human appeal of the narrative, and the humour coupled with an intensely Christian spirit that pervades it.

The arrangement of the narrative is geographical rather than historical. It carries the reader first to Norfolk Island in the south, for many years the headquarters of the Mission, and takes him through the New Hebrides, or rather those islands of the group which fall within the area of the Melanesian Mission, on through the Banks and Reef Islands, to the Solomons in the north. A description is given of the islands called at on the cruise, and of the life and customs of their primitive inhabitants; and it were well if this book could fall into the hands of such anthropologists or others who believe and teach that native life should be left to itself and that there should be no interference with native customs. For custom in these islands sanctioned at one time inter-island raids and head-hunting, cannibalism, a fierce vendetta according to which a life must always be taken for a life, and the ruthless slaying of unborn children. Beyond others, the islanders of Malaita were fierce and degraded in habit, living a life which showed itself in the repulsiveness of their appearance, and the writer can testify from what he has seen of the difference in face and look and in manner of life which Christianity has brought.

Primarily the book is an account of things seen and done in the South Seas, and the missionary element is kept in the background. Yet it is there, and some of the best passages in the book are those which tell of the heroic lives and deaths of both white and native workers. The story of the death of Bishop Patteson is related, as of the young Australian priest, Charles Godden, and of the heroism of native workers left alone to break new ground in heathen islands; and whether as a simple story of the South Sea Islands and their people, or as a record of that which Christ has wrought amongst them, the book is one to be read and enjoyed.

P. H. MICKLEM.

THE TREASURE OF SÃO ROQUE. A sidelight on the Counter-reformation.
By W. Telfer, M.A. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

This is an interesting book, and one of real, if curious, learning. The author's object has been to present an extensive collection of unpublished nineteenth-century deeds authenticating relics of the saints, and to extract from them such historical information as they were capable of furnishing. Instead of roaming over Europe he has made an intensive study of the relics, and the deeds relating to them, laid up in the Treasury of the Church of São Roque at Lisbon, which contains one of the first collections of such things in Europe. For details the reader must be referred to the book itself. Two points may be noticed here. One is the prominence into which the Counter-reformation brought the cult of relics. There had been a reaction against them even before the Reformation. Readers of Erasmus will recall the disgust which Colet exhibited, and Erasmus felt, but concealed, when the soiled linen of St. Thomas of Canterbury was offered to them for their veneration. When the Reformation storm had burst no abuses were attacked more confidently than those which arose out of this cult.

A marked feature of the Counter-reformation was its aggressive spirit. It was a real counter-attack. It carried the war into the camp of the enemy. Protestants had treated the cult of relics as indefensible. Jesuits, the standard-bearers of the Counter-reformation, put them in the forefront, and stimulated devotion to them in every possible way. Men like Colet and Erasmus regarded the veneration of relics as an unfortunate concession to human weakness, and would have kept it within as narrow bounds as possible. The Jesuits, on the other hand, regarded it as a mark of the true Catholic ethos and encouraged it as much as possible. The other point that comes out is an interesting question of casuistry. The authentications of the relics are far from being convincing testimonies as to their genuineness. If a relic has once been allowed, even if little is known of its history, its authenticity is not again called in question. The great matter is that they can stimulate devotion. It is obvious that genuineness is not necessary for this purpose. Provided the worshipper thinks the relics are genuine his devotion may be stimulated as much by "pigges bones," as by the actual bones of a saint. It is not suggested that relics, known to be spurious, were presented to the devout for adoration, but it is fairly plain that the policy of the responsible authorities has been to treat genuineness as a secondary matter. This is shown by the way of meeting a difficulty that confronted the pious traveller in quest of relics at a very early stage, namely, the number of relics in existence which professed to be identical. The explanation put forward by the Jesuit Jean Ferrand was that such objects as the Crown of Thorns and the picture of our Lady, painted by St. Luke, were so necessary for devotion that God had permitted their miraculous multiplication. This defence, one imagines, has long been abandoned; nevertheless it is probable that those in authority in the Roman Church are more concerned to promote piety by encouraging the veneration of relics, than to promote truth by too close a scrutiny into their genuineness.

In the words of the author: "The principles at stake are of wider application than concern the veneration of relics. There is, on one hand, the mind's need of absolute intellectual honesty; and on the other, there is the heart's need of unquestioning devotion to an object of worship. It should be possible to satisfy these two needs simultaneously, instead of

sacrificing one to the other. And this is still a fundamental problem of religion." It is, indeed. A parallel problem occurs even in the choice of hymn tunes. Is a priest justified in using a tune which he believes to be intrinsically bad, because it is popular and thought, by those who like it, to be edifying?

C. P. S. CLARKE.

THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH. By Pierre Rousselot, S.J., L. de Grand Maison, V. Huby, S.J., Alexandre Brou, M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

This is a translation of a collection of essays by French authors, to which the editor, Fr. D'Arcy, S.J., contributes a foreword and the two concluding chapters. Throughout there is a very frank treatment of modern critical problems, and we are glad to note a generous recognition of the contribution of Anglican scholars to their solution. There is less sympathy for the Greeks, to whom is attached the blame for misguided devotion to bogus relics in the Middle Ages, through their having imposed on the credulity of the Latins. On the other hand, the disastrous results of the Great Schism of the eleventh century are freely allowed. In the concluding essay it is suggested "of all the characteristics of the Catholic Church, her uncompromisingness in doctrine is . . . the most gloriously attractive." But is it true to say that Rome never compromises? Even within the covers of this volume we find it admitted that "Vigilius and Honorius showed themselves a little too accommodating" (p. 155).

As a brief study of the development of Latin Christianity, and its relation to successive phases of human thought and history, the book has a value out of all proportion to its size.

TREVOR JALLAND.

THE NATURE AND THE EFFECT OF THE HERESY OF THE FRATICELLI.
By Decima L. Douie, Ph.D. Manchester University Press.
17s. 6d.

This is a book for experts in Franciscan studies, not for the general reader. The text and footnotes have been written with erudition remarkable in a young writer who makes her *début* with this volume. Not only have all the modern authorities, Italian, German, French and English, been ransacked, but Dr. Douie has a wide knowledge of the numerous manuscript literature of the subject. Her work begins with a survey of the "origin and development of the spiritual party in the Franciscan Order," it then describes the influence of Joachim of Flora. With this chapter should be read the volume on Joachim by Mr. Bett, in the "Great Medieval Churchmen Series," edited by Dr. Binns. Miss Douie outlines the life and work of Angelo da Clareno, John Olivi and Ubertino da Casale. The dispute on the poverty of Christ and His disciples, between Pope John XXII. and one section of the Fraticelli, occupies another chapter, followed by a detailed description of the Fraticelli, clearly defining their place in the Franciscan movement. A brief account of the Beguins of France distinguishes this sect, with some reserve, from the Beghards of the Netherlands and Germany. The book closes with a valuable account of the literature of the Franciscan Spirituals and their modern investigators.

Miss Douie describes the seventeenth-century Kentish writer, Dr. Brown, as "a serious scholar," yet Dr. Brown did not scruple, through a

misunderstanding or through the misuse of a statement of Archbishop Parker, to make the entirely ungrounded charge against Lanfranc, of corrupting the text of the New Testament; even Böhmer did not go so far as this (*cf. Lanfranc, His Life Work and Writing*, Oxford, 1926, p. 60, n. 3).

A. J. MACDONALD.

THE GOLDEN SEQUENCE. A Fourfold Study of the Spiritual Life. By Evelyn Underhill. Methuen. 5s.

Miss Underhill describes her latest work, which is the most valuable she has given us, as "a personal little book" which "represents the precipitation of her own thoughts" and does not seek to establish some new thesis. She acknowledges for it two sufficiently august and diverse godparents, St. John of the Cross and Professor Whitehead; but the reader will discover that, like all well-brought-up children, it has three godparents, the third, and perhaps the most influential, being Baron von Hügel, not the least merit of the book being that balanced treatment of apparent contraries so characteristic of the Baron.

This work is by no means a commentary on the Golden Sequence, indeed that sublime invocation of the Holy Spirit might drop out of the text without disturbing its argument in the least, but it is accurately described by its sub-title. It is divided into four closely packed sections: Spirit; Spiritual Life; Purification; Prayer.

In the first section Miss Underhill summarizes the Christian doctrine of the Spirit thus: "By the Christian doctrine of the Spirit we mean God Himself in His holy reality and love, in so far as these can be known to us: the utter distinctness of His Eternal Being, yet His intimate cherishing care for His whole creation. We do not mean some immaterial energy, the soul of an evolving universe. We mean a substantial Reality, which is there first in its absolute perfection and living plenitude; which transcends yet penetrates our world, our activity, our souls, and draws its transcending power from the fact that it is already perfect" (p. 28). We particularly welcome her insistence on the "substantial Reality which is there first," as also her fundamental discrimination between what she calls the Immanent and Imminent Will of God as well as her teaching on revelation and the sacraments.

Part II. is well founded upon the absolute priority of God and therefore of Grace; for "in the great strange work of man's spiritualization the initiative ever lies with God and His Spirit, not with us . . . we matter and our transformation matters only in so far as we and it contribute to God's total purpose—the only thing that matters at all" (pp. 49, 50). (*Strange*, by the way, is a favourite word with our author, but seems singularly out of place.) Our action in the spiritual life is a constant balance of a dynamic abandonment (not a "limp surrender") of self to the Will of God and God-directed initiative.

This leads straight to the important subject of Purification, which is treated with understanding and clarity (though we believe Miss Underhill to be mistaken on at least one point in her exposition of the teaching of St. John of the Cross on the Dark Nights). There is much that is of value also in the concluding section, particularly the treatment of Intercession, which should open up a new point of view to many readers.

We may be permitted two grumbles: first at the complete absence of references. Nothing is more irritating to the careful reader than to be

met by a quotation (and there are many in this book) which gives him no means of verifying either itself or its context. Secondly, we would deprecate the author's occasional lapses into jargon. We may instance "aura," "self-mergence," "unselfed," "our life towards Spirit," and, worst and most frequent of all, "God-spirit." This last term is simply horrible to a religious mind (and this is a religious book), and cannot even be commended for philosophical or theological precision.

There are various points of detail which might be criticized were there space, but the book as a whole should prove extremely illuminating to a wide circle of readers.

F. P. HARTON.

THE CHURCH A NECESSARY EVIL. By the late Alfred Fawkes, with a Memoir by H. D. A. Major, D.D., Principal of Ripon Hall. Basil Blackwell. 4s. 6d.

A brief notice of this collection of characteristic sermons by so remarkable a man as Alfred Fawkes cannot undertake to examine the contents from a theological or ecclesiastical point of view. It is true that the sermons are all theological and ecclesiastical, and as such are strongly modernist and erastian; but they are also deeply religious. Those already in sympathy with the writer's mind will delight to possess a collection of brilliant papers, and others will also be well rewarded by a study of them. There is great gain to be derived from the discovery of just how a keen and intensely religious mind was profoundly convinced of the wrongness of ideas about the Church, the creeds and the Sacraments that are held as certainly good and true by catholic Christians. Not always could a reader of the latter class accept the account of his own views that is presupposed, as a just estimate or adequate presentation, but he will certainly be led to ask himself whether he has himself done justice to the other point of view. Above all there is a rare distinction about the writer and his utterances which affords that mental and spiritual tonic which it was presumably the purpose of the sermons to supply.

A. R. BROWNE-WILKINSON.

THE HIGHWAY OF THE CHURCH'S YEAR. By Fr. Thomas, O.S.B. The Centenary Press. 3s. 6d.

Gratitude is due to any one who attempts to help people to meditate. The need is great even among instructed Christians in order to deepen their hold on spiritual things in these distracting days. Many are anxious to learn. Fr. Thomas, therefore, in producing his book, has made a considerable contribution towards supplying this need. The priests who urged him to publish did well in doing so.

The language for the most part is simple and the points made are expressed very shortly. This may err on the side of attributing to the ordinary person an imagination which is not generally his strong point. Anyhow he avoids, what he himself deprecates, a sermon which the reader can just preach to himself. The book is written for instructed Catholics and is based on the Church's doctrines. These doctrines are very simply stated and will be understood by those who are so instructed, but the method may curtail the circle of those who use the book, for many who are anxious to learn how to meditate are not so well informed as Fr. Thomas

evidently hopes. But the passages of Scripture placed at the head of each meditation will be of great assistance to the less well instructed.

It is a difficult thing to make resolutions for other people, and those who follow Fr. Thomas's directions in this matter should read his notes carefully in the beginning of the book to see how he intends the suggested resolutions to be used. Unless a resolution has some bearing on conduct its purpose has been missed. The volume would be more attractive had a bolder type been chosen for the print. Bulk could have been avoided by the use of thinner paper. In spite of glasses there are so many whose eyes are troubled by small print.

W. E. L.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL TEACHING OF ST. AUGUSTINE. By James Morgan, D.D. Elliot Stock. 7s. 6d.

The mind and writings of St. Augustine, "the first modern man," are a perennial source of interest and inspiration to subsequent ages. Some of his concepts were great and immediate gains for Christian thought, such as the immateriality of spirit and of the human soul; others had to wait for fruition until the great philosophical revival of the seventeenth century and to reappear in European consciousness only with Descartes or some would say even later still. It is not surprising that the literature dealing with the voluminous works of this Doctor is perplexing in its immensity. But on no subject is he more worthy of study than on psychology, for he stands at the very beginning of a science that makes a special appeal to modern thought. In this book Dr. Morgan has brought together the various and indeed often inconsistent threads of Augustine's teaching about the soul. There are chapters on the sources of that teaching; on Manichæism, against which it is largely a revolt; on the will and its freedom, in whatever sense it can be called free; on the possibility of knowledge; and on the proofs of the existence of God. Each chapter is illustrated by a wealth of quotation from St. Augustine and other writers, which is evidence of deep and of very wide reading. The book is, however, disfigured by far too large a number of misprints, especially in the Latin quotations, which sometimes obscure the sense of the passages in which they occur. Very frequently, again, a little more explanation of philosophical and theological allusions would have made the book more serviceable to the non-expert reader.

W. R. V. BRADE.

IN JOB'S BALANCES: ON THE SOURCES OF ETERNAL TRUTHS. By Leo Chestov. J. M. Dent and Sons. 18s.

This is a very curious book by a modern Russian writer. Originally written in Russian, it has been translated into German and the present English version is made from the German, but has been compared with the original Russian for the translator. The work represents a type of thought and treatment somewhat unfamiliar in Western Europe, especially in connection with philosophy. The upshot of the book is a sustained attack on all idealism and indeed upon all attempts to present a rational account of the Universe. Tertullian's saying *Credo quia impossibile est* is more than once quoted with approval, but perhaps not quite in Tertullian's sense. The general position has affinities with Bergson, but M. Chestov complains that Bergson does not go nearly far enough in his repudiation

of reason and in fact gives in to it in the end. It is a matter of no little difficulty to seize the Author's real thought, and the continual metaphors and general literary style do not help the reader in this regard. The book consists of three main divisions; the first and the last are occupied with rather diffuse literary criticism of Dostoievsky, Tolstoy, Pascal and other writers. The middle portion contains a series of rather disconnected paragraphs on a variety of topics, "The Ideal and the Material," "The Secret of Existence," "Death and Sleep," and so on. Reason is always an unsafe guide, general statements in logic or in any other discipline can never be trusted, and "truth" is always personal and fugitive. A simpler style, fewer metaphors and literary flourishes, and a much more direct treatment of the points at issue would have greatly enhanced the value of the work. As it is, the reader is only too likely to be dissuaded from further attempts to fathom the Author's meaning by the difficulties inherent in the manner of treatment chosen for the discussion, and to doubt whether the mental effort that would be demanded would be really compensated in the end.

W. R. V. BRADF.

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND, A.D. 432-1932. Church of Ireland Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd., Dublin. 2s.

On October 11-14, 1932, a Conference was held in Dublin by the Church of Ireland to commemorate the 1,500th anniversary of the landing of St. Patrick. This book is the report of the Conference. It contains, besides the opening sermon by the Bishop of Killaloe, the sermon which the Bishop of Durham would have preached if he had not been ill, and the opening address and closing sermon by the Archbishop of Dublin, thirty-three papers by different writers, all members of the Church of Ireland, covering a vast range of subjects, from the life of St. Patrick to the modern Poor Law.

It is impossible to review such a book in detail. One can only observe its general character, and mention a few points of outstanding importance.

In the first place, the report is of much greater interest than the reports of similar congresses in England usually are. Every paper is readable, and many contain valuable information which is difficult to obtain elsewhere. The first four sections, dealing with St. Patrick, the Ancient Irish Church, the Religious Witness of the Church, and the Mediæval and Post-Reformation periods, almost amount to a history of the Church of Ireland from the fifth century to the nineteenth.

Secondly, there is very little trace of the narrow Puritanism which is generally supposed to be characteristic of the Church of Ireland. The papers are, it is true, concerned with history rather than with doctrine, but, with one or two exceptions, they represent what may be called a fully Anglican standard. It is to be hoped that the book will have a wide circulation in England, where nearly everyone is profoundly ignorant of Irish history. It has been well said that "Irish history is for Englishmen to remember and Irishmen to forget." The study of these pages would remove many popular mistakes, and would show how largely English action in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is responsible for the present condition of Ireland and of the Irish Church.

The fifth section was conducted entirely in the Irish language, and was very well attended, especially by young people. The Archbishop of

Dublin was present, and three of the four speakers were clergymen. The Irish Guild of the Church, which exists to promote Gaelic interests in the Church of Ireland, had, we understand, a good deal to do with the arranging of the Conference, and it is encouraging to see that the younger generation are showing themselves in sympathy with the idea that the Church of Ireland is, as the Archbishop said, "the most Irish thing there is in Ireland" (p. 235).

One important point which was emphasized is that the peculiarities of the Celtic Church were not due to St. Patrick: they came from other sources. St. Patrick was a Roman citizen with a strong sense of order, but he seems to have been almost alone, and after his time Keltic tribalism prevailed. Another point, which Mr. H. C. Lawlor brings out clearly, is the remarkable resemblance of early Irish monasticism to that of the East: it came straight from Egypt, and had little (at that period) to do with the Benedictine monasticism of Latin Europe. Early Irish Christianity clearly was more akin to the Orthodox Eastern Communion than to any other modern form of Christianity.

The long roll of modern Irish missionaries given by the Bishop of Ossory includes the first overseas bishop of the Anglican Communion (outside the U.S.A.) (Inglis of Nova Scotia), the first Archbishop of Ottawa, the first Anglican missionary in Persia, and the first Anglican bishop in China: but it should have mentioned one of the most remarkable missionaries of our Communion, the Rev. W. H. Browne of the Archbishop's Assyrian Mission, who lived the life of an Eastern monk for many years at Qudshanis in Kurdistan.

Of the papers on modern subjects in the two last sections the two most striking are Mr. Bolton Waller's, on Gambling, and His Honour Judge Thompson's, on Church Building. "In ancient days," says Mr. Waller, "the emissaries of Ireland were missionaries carrying the Gospel: now they are to be touts carrying lottery tickets." "If anyone says that he is giving 10s. to the hospitals by taking a ticket, your reply is this: Don't be a fool; give 2s. 6d. to a hospital direct, and keep 7s. 6d. yourself. The hospital will gain 7½d., and it is 3,000 to 1 that you will gain 7s. 6d."

Judge Thompson says that while there are 10,500 ancient churches still in use in England, there are only about sixty in Ireland. The reason is that the great majority were ruined in the wars before and after the Reformation. The English would neither allow the development of a native central government nor govern the country justly themselves.

The Church of Ireland is very much to be congratulated on the excellent attendance at this Conference, and on the high standard of the papers. At the end of the book is a photograph of "Five Archbishops at Armagh" (Canterbury, Armagh, Dublin, Wales, and the Primus of Scotland), and an account of the services held in commemoration of St. Patrick in all the Irish dioceses.

C. B. Moss.

SELFHOOD AND SACRIFICE. By Frank Gavin, Ph.D. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

It is often alleged that preachers today rarely give their congregations direct instruction on Christian ethical and social duty without lapsing either into a dull exposition of moral law or a vague and platitudinous sentimentality. Dr. Gavin's addresses on the Seven Words from the Cross cannot be charged with this deficiency. He deals with the questions that

puzzle the ordinary man; and he finds their solution, not in a theoretical justification of the dealings of God with man, but in a practical exposition of the Catholic way of life, the life of "seeking and giving fellowship," when self is realized by sacrifice. The more the claim of the Christian Society is recognized, the fuller is the maturity of the individual soul. Catholicism offers a solution to the problems of life where a recrudescence of Stoicism or Hedonism and a half-digested version of the new psychology fail.

These addresses provide a very great deal of food for thought in a very small space. The author's account of contrition and of faith, and his "working theory" of the Atonement are particularly valuable. There is scarcely a page which does not contain some arresting sentence which the reader will wish to "mark" and the preacher will wish to quote. For while the direct and practical nature of these addresses and the absence of rhetorical embellishment render them valuable to any who wish to clarify their ideas about the problem of evil, the problem of God's love to man, or the problem of man's purpose in life, they will also provide suggestions as to the treatment of the Words from the Cross, which those who conduct the Three Hours' Devotion sorely need and rarely find.

HUMPHRY BEEVOR.

BOOK NOTES

The Spirit of the Living God. Addresses given at the Cromer Conference, 1932. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. This volume will be welcomed not only by those who took part in the Convention, but also by a far wider Christian public who wish to extend and deepen their understanding of the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Sermons for the Christian Year. By H. L. Goudge, D.D. Skeffington. 6s. The Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford University in this book puts forward a selection of his sermons, choosing those which are practical rather than academic. They range over a great part of the Church's Year, and will be found helpful and stimulating.

We are Able. The Living of the Christian Life. By James Wareham. Mowbrays. 3s. 6d. The Christian life is presented as difficult but, by the grace of God, achievable. Stress is laid on the need of making a serious business of religion, the need of effort that is strenuous, sensible, and steady. A thoughtful book enriched by a ready use of quotations drawn from a wide range of devotional literature.

The Labour of Love. By A. W. Hopkinson. Mowbrays. 3s. 6d. An old Christian writes to young Christians. He finds them intensely critical, impatient of weakness and failure in the Christian life and in the Christian Church. He challenges them to be positive, and attempts to present a Christian love that calls for every positive quality of character.

Stories and Lessons. Old Testament. Part I. Genesis. By Marion Power. S.P.C.K. 3s. Many people wishing to teach the early part of the Old Testament to children find themselves baffled in mind. Here is a book which will meet their case. It is admirably done, it is sincere and it is reverent. It is written with a very obvious knowledge of children's

mind, and would seem to us again and again to make the right approach. The teacher is provided with a sufficient amount of technical knowledge, for example, concerning the various narratives which were finally brought together in the present form of the book Genesis. But such information necessary for sincere teaching is subordinated to the positive spiritual element in each episode. It is written primarily for those who wish to teach children between the ages of eight and ten, but it will be found most useful by clergy and teachers as a basis for teaching Genesis to people of all ages. The form of the title encourages us to hope that this is the first of a series.

H. L. C.

Security by Disarmament. By G. Norman Robbins, B.Sc. Williams and Norgate. 2s. 6d. Mr. Robbins brings forward the usual arguments against war to prove that armament produces insecurity, and paints a picture of the Utopia which would ensue if Britain were to carry out complete disarmament in a year, when "our men-of-war could be used to give sea voyages to invalids." We remember the glowing predictions made when the United States declared for prohibition. The results have hardly justified Mr. Robbins' faith in human nature as such. Incidentally, the Sudan owes thirty years of security to a war.

Modern India Thinks. Edited by K. R. Luckmidas. Taraporevala Sons and Co., Bombay; Kegan Paul, London. Rs. 6. India has been accused of thinking only in terms of its great intellectual past. This selection of extracts from modern writers—Tagore, Gandhi, Sister Nivedita, etc.—aims at showing that India is escaping from this "timid, enervating, anæmic mental attitude," and "as of old, facing reality." The extracts range from "Culture" and "Education," about thirty pages each, to "Social Service" with three. But in these three is a touch of the truth which is "too precious to be taken secondhand." It is an insult to offer poor relief in a spirit of philanthropy, "for the rich have their riches, the beautiful their beauty . . . but the poor have only their pride." Social service must be rendered in the spirit of humility.

M. D. R. W.